EXHIBIT B.113

	Dama 1		Dama 2
	Page 1		Page 3
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	1	APPEARANCES
	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	2	Appearing for the Plaintiffs:
		3	Kent A. Yalowitz, Esq.
	MARKA GOVOLOWA	4	Lucy McMillan, Esq.
	MARK I. SOKOLOW, et al.,	5	ARNOLD & PORTER LLP
	Plaintiffs,	6	399 Park Avenue
	Coo No	7	New York, NY 10022-4690
	- vs - Case No.	8 9	Tel: +1 212.715.1113 Fax: +1 212.715.1399
	04-CV-397(GBD)(RLE)	10	
		11	Email: Kent. Yalowitz@aporter.com
	PALESTINE LIBERATION	12	Lucy.McMillan@aporter.com.
	ORGANIZATION, et al.,	13	Appearing for the Defendants:
	ORGANIZATION, et al.,	14	Appearing for the Defendants: Brian A. Hill, Esq.
	Defendants.	15	Michael J. Satin, Esq.
	Defendants.	16	MILLER CHEVALIER CHARTERED
		17	655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
	DEPOSITION OF DR. SHARON WEILL	18	Suite 900
	Friday, November 22, 2013	19	Washington, D.C. 20005-5701
	9:12 a.m.	20	Tel: 202-626-5800
	7.12 d.iii.	21	Fax: 202-626-5801
		22	Email: bhill@milchev.com
	Reported by:	23	msatin@milchev.com
	Fiona Farson	24	
	Ref. No.: 10764	25	
	Page 2		Page 4
1	5	1	INDEX
1 2	Dangition of Dr. Charan Waill	2	EXAMINATION OF DR. SHARON WEILL PAGE
3	Deposition of Dr. Sharon Weill November 22, 2013	3	BY MR. YALOWITZ 5
4	9:12 a.m.	4	DI WK. I/LOWIIZ
5	7.12 d.m.	5	
6		6	EXHIBIT INDEX
7	Taken at:	7	EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE
8	The offices of Arnold & Porter LLP	8	Exhibit 1 Expert report by Sharon Weill 14
9	International Financial Centre	9	Exhibit 2 The Judicial Arm of the Occupation,
10	25 Old Broad Street	10	by Sharon Weill 14
11	London EC2N	11	Exhibit 3 Expert report of Daniel Reisner 32
12		12	Exhibit 4 Salim Hamdam v. Donald H. Rumsfeld 124
13		13	Exhibit 5 36 I.L.M. 551 134
14		14	Exhibit 6 36 I.L.M, *634 134
15		15	
16		16	
17		17	
18		18	
19		19	
20		20	
21		21	
22		22	
23		23	
24		24	
25		25	

Priday, November 22, 2013 Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL 2 Q. Did you — did you ever work with the GSS during your training.		Page 5		Page 7
2 Deposition of DR. SHARON WEIL . 3 (9:12 a.m.) 4 Examination by MR. YALOWITZ: 5 BY MR. YALOWITZ: 5 Q. God morning, Dr. Weill. 7 A. Good morning, Dr. Weill. 7 A. Good morning in today. 9 I wanted to ask you what a "lord law bachelor" is. 1 Q. the first degree in law. 1 Q. a man day and the first degree of law. 1 Q. an advanced degree? 1 A. Irst first ferse and a half years studying in interesting the first degree of law. 1 Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. 1 Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. 2 Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. 3 Q. and minted to the Israeli Bar in the year 4 A. Yeah. 2 Q. Did you practice law in Israel? 2 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 2 Q. Where did you do your training? 3 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 4 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal adspeak to the judges? 3 Q. A No, we — because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are fare passage in court, but not the cases to the prosecutor of reses. Because the — the cases fare awas working with the prosecutor I was working with the non-the prosecutor of the exam at the Bar, withing and then in the prosecutor of these may be a case as a trainee, did you agrear in court one year fraining? 4 A. No, we — because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are for year lawyer; right? So we are from the IDF? 5 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 5 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 5 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 5 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 5 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 5 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training and then in Tel Aviv University, and there, thad specific electron of the law, military courts of passage and th	1	Friday, November 22, 2013	1	cases. So it was mostly rape cases.
3 (Psl 2 a.m.) 4 Examination by MR, YALOWITZ. 5 BY MR, YALOWITZ. 6 Q. Good morning, Dr. Well. 7 A. Good morning. 8 Q. Thank you for coming in today. 9 I wanted to ask you what a "lord law bachclor" is. 10 A. The first degree in law. 11 Q. Is it like a university degree, or a 12 A. Yeah. 13 Q. – an advanced degree? 14 A. If the first – it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. 15 Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. 16 Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. 17 You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? 18 A. No. I did my law training – after 1 studied law in Tel 24 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 23 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 21 I continue studying. 25 Q. Where did you do your training? 26 Q. Where did you do your training? 27 A. A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. 28 Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a training. 29 District Court, as a training. 30 Q. Is that a civilian and criminal matters, yeah. 40 Q. Civilian 41 A. No. We because we are not yet lawyer, right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the fifses with prosecutor we help in this kind of thing, And then we appear in court, but not the 50 bistrict Court; as a training. 41 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases K was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in the IDF? 4 A. No. tweet — in the IDF? 4 A. No. tweet in the IDF? 4 A. No. the training. 5 Q. What did you do? 4 I Israel Chali-bul, human resource department; I think it's call the Navy, so I was in an office in the IDF? 4 A. No. The chiral prove should not in the Navy, so I was in an office in the IDF? 4 A. No. The chiral prove should not in the Navy, so I was in an office in the IDF? 4 A. No. The chiral prove should not in the Navy, so I was in an office in the IDF? 4 A. No. The chiral prove should not in the Navy, so		· ·	2	
Examination by MR, YALOWITZ: B MR, YALOWITZ: G Q, Good morning, Dr. Weill. A. Good morning, Dr. Weill. A. Good morning. I wanted to ask you what a "lord law bachelor" is. A. The first degree in law. Q. Is it like a university degree, or a A. Yeah. A. Wein in the first degree of law. Q. A It sike first it's three and a half years studying in inversity, and it's the first degree of law. Q. All right: thank you. That's helpful to me. You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? A. Yeah. A. No. Was in the human resource department; I think it's called Chalizhut, human resources. And I was based in the Navy, so I was in an office in Haffa, of the Navy. If's because I lived quite close, so I was, like, working the wind in the Year 2000? A. Yeah. Q. All right: thank you. That's helpful to me. You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? A. Yeah. A. No. I did my law training after I studied law in Tel 24 vivitouriestily, ald do no year training, and then I did the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; I continue studying. A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal law. A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal law. A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer, right? So we are the files with prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in more. A. Yeah. A. Yeah. A. Yeah. A. No, we are difficent and a half years studying with the prosecutor of reses. Because the the cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in the Size of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in the year 2000? A. Yeah: A. No, we are didnited to the Israeli military courts were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in the year 2000? A. Yeah: A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer, right? So we are the file with prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in the prosecutor of the cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in the search of the processor of the search of the processo		-	3	
6 Q. Good morning. Dr. Weill. 7 A. Good morning. 9 I wanted to ask you what a "lord law bachelor" is. 1 A. The first degree in law. 1 Q. Is it like a university degree, or a 2 A. Yeah. 2 I was in the human resource department; I think it's called Chalizhut, human resources. And I was based in the Navy, so I was in an office in Haifa, of the Navy. It's - because I lived quite close, so I was, like, working in the office there. 1 A. It's the first - it's three and a half years studying in university, and it he hard are defined to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year and you were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year You were dath year you were wing in Israel? A. Yeah. On I did my law training — after I studied law in Tel Aviv University, I did one year training, and then Ida day you aper training, and then Ida day you were training, and the Park You You were admitted you were You you were training, and the Ida day you were training, and the Ida day you were training. And the you we have you were you y	4		4	A. No. Not in the training.
7 Å. Good morning. 8 Q. Thank you for coming in today. 9 I warned to ask you what a "lord law bachelor" is. 10 A. The first degree in law. 11 Q. Is it like a university degree, or a — 12 A. Yeah. 13 Q. — an advanced degree? 14 A. It's the first – it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. 15 in university, and it's the first degree of law. 16 Q. All right, thank you. That's helpful to me. 17 You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? 18 A. Yeah. 20 Q. Did you practice law in Israel? 21 A. No. I did my law training – after I studied law in Tel 2 Avic University, I did one year training, and then I did the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 22 A. University, I did one year training, and then I did in the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 23 division. 24 I continue studying. 25 Q. Where did you do your training? 26 Where did you do your training? 27 A. I was a first of the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? 28 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal law law. 29 Q. Civilian — 20 Q. Civilian — 21 A. No, we — because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stugaiare," they call it in Israel; so we work on the bisses of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 29 Q. Did you wroking with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 20 Q. Did you wrok on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 20 A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor ware big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 21 Q. Did you wrok on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 22 A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor ware working with the prosecutor of the due process right in the military courts. It think on his I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 23 A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with the prosecutor of the due process right in the military courts. It think to his I concentrate to one specific lecture	5	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	5	Q. And not elsewhere?
8 Q. Thank you for coming in today. 10 A. The first degree in law. 11 Q. Is it like a university degree, or a - 12 A. Yeah. 13 Q an advanced degree? 14 A. It's the first - It's three and a half years studying in university, and its the first degree of law. 16 Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. 17 You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? 19 A. Yeah. 20 Q. Did you practice law in Israel? 21 A. No. I did my law training - after I studied law in Tel 21 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 22 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 24 I continue studying. 25 Q. Where did you do your training? 26 Q. Where did you do your training? 27 A. Yeah. 28 A. No. it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal law. 29 District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? 30 Q. Is that a civilian and criminal matters, yeah. 41 A. No. we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the bistrict Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. 31 Page and whatever, but we didn't appear in tess. 22 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 42 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the causes I was working with the prosecutor I was working with the prosecutor of the due process right in the military courts, Ithink on this I concentrate to one year of training? 4 A. No. it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with the class, to the law, in the field Chalizhut, human resource department; I think it's A. It was in the buman resource department; I think it's the Navy. It's because I live duite close, so I was, like, working in the office there. 4 A. Yeah Part French. 5 Q. Did you work fire the Navy. 6 Q. All think buman resource department; I think it's the Navy. 8 A. Yeah Part French. 9 Q. All think buman resource department; I think it's the Navy. 18 A. Yeah Part French. 19 Q. All think buman resource department; I think i	6	Q. Good morning, Dr. Weill.	6	A. No.
1 Namted to ask you what a "lord law bachelor" is. 1 Q. Is it like a university degree, or a — 1 A. Yeah. 1 Q. Is it like a university degree, or a — 1 A. Yeah. 1 Q. a madvanced degree? 1 A. It's the first - it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. 1 Q. a madvanced degree? 1 A. It's the first - it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. 1 Q. a madvanced degree? 1 A. It's the first - it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. 1 Q. a madvanced degree? 1 A. It's the first - it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. 2 Q. Q. Did you were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? 2 Q. Did you grow (in Israeli? 2000? 2 Q. Did you grow in Israel? 2 A. No. Idid my law training - after I studied law in Tel 21 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 4 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 24 I continue studying. 2 Q. Where did you do your training? 2 Q. Where did you do your training? 3 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 4 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil - but criminal advision. 5 Q. Aid did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court are 'stagiaire,' they call it in Israel; so we work on 1 the swith prosecutor, we help in this kind of 1 thing. And then we appear in court, or high in thing. And then we appear in court, but not the 1 District Court, only first instance court, or rather 1 thing. And then we appear in court, or high in thing. And then we appear in court, but not the 2 point of raining? 4 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, only first instance court, or rather 1 thing. And then we appear in court, or a point and where, the went of the law, military coress; Imminor offenses. 3 Q. Mad did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court are 'stagiaire,' they call it in Israel; so we wor	7	A. Good morning.	7	Q. Not ever?
10 Q. What did you do? 11 Q. Is it like a university degree, or a— 12 A. Yeah. 13 Q. — an advanced degree? 14 A. It's the first — it's three and a half years studying 15 in university, and it's the first degree of law. 16 Q. All right, thank you. That's helpful to me. 17 You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 18 2000? 19 A. Yeah. 20 Q. Did you practice law in Israel? 21 A. No. I did my law training — after I studied law in Tel 22 Aviv University. I did one year training, and then I did 23 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 24 I continue studying. 25 Q. Where did you do your training? 26 Q. Where did you do your training? 27 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. 28 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 29 A. No, it was a trainage, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? 30 Q. Is did did you as part of your work in the Tel Aviv 4 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal thing. And then we appear in court thing. And then we appear in court, or a filter thing. And then we appear in court, or a filter of the serve is registration. 31 Q. Magistrate court? 32 Q. Find the Years of your work in the Tel Aviv 33 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 4 A. No, it was a trainee, did you appear in court thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court, only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. 32 Q. Magistrate court? 33 Q. Find the Years of your work in the Tel Aviv 4 A. No, it was a trainee, did you appear in court thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court, only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. 34 Q. Magistrate court? 35 Q. Magistrate court? 36 A. Yeah. Q. Magistrate court? 37 A. Yeah. Q. And you specific all your work in the Tel Aviv 4 A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor were hig cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in hese cases I was working with the prosecutor were hig cases. 36 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of	8	Q. Thank you for coming in today.	8	You served in the IDF?
11 Q. Is it like a university degree, or a — 12 A. Yeah. 13 Q. — an advanced degree? 14 A. It she first — it's three and a half years studying 15 in university, and it's the first degree of law. 16 Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. 17 You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 18 2000? 19 A. Yeah. 20 Q. Did you practice law in Israel? 21 A. No. I did my law training — after I studied law in Tel 22 A. No. I did my law training — after I studied law in Tel 23 division. 24 I continue studying. 25 Q. Where did you do your training? 26 Q. Where did you do your training? 27 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal 28 division. 29 Q. Sid you grow up in Israel? 20 Q. Where did you do your training? 21 Q. Where did you do your training? 22 division. 3 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 4 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal 5 law. 6 Q. Civilian — 6 Q. Civilian — 7 A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. 8 Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv 9 District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? 11 A. No, we — because we are not yet lawyer, right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on 15 thing. And then we appear in court, or a military courts three time — I mean, three different years — three 17 Q. Magistrate court? 18 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the — the 19 cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases 17 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your 28 one year of training? 29 A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 20 A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 21 Concentrate to one specific electure of two hours. 22 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 24 A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with	9	I wanted to ask you what a "lord law bachelor" is.	9	A. Yeah.
2. A. Yeah. 2. A. Yeah in university, and it's the first degree of law. 3. Fis the first — it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. 4. A. Is' the first — it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. 4. Vou were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? 4. A. Yeah. 4. A. Yeah. 4. A. No. I did my law training — after I studied law in Tel 2. Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 24 I continue studying. 4. A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal division. 5. Q. I st that a civilian court, or a military court? 6. Q. Civilian — A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal law. 6. Q. Civilian — A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal law. 6. Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, are arrainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? 6. A. No, we — because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are are stagaiare, "they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court, are arrainee, did you appear in court, but not the District Court, are arrainee, did you appear in court, but not the District Court, are arrainee, did you appear in court, but not the District Court, are arrainee, did you appear in court, but not the District Court, are arrainee, did you appear in court, but not the District Court, are arrainee, did you appear in court the minor offenses. Because the — the cases I was working in the office there. 4. A. No, it was — I mean, the year of training. 4. A. In and the varie with my family. 4. A. No, it was — I mean, the year of training. 5. A. Yeah. 5. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your once year of training? 6. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your once year of training? 7. A. Yeah. But really minor offens	10	A. The first degree in law.	10	Q. What did you do?
13	11	Q. Is it like a university degree, or a	11	A. I was in the human resource department; I think it's
14 A. It's the first – it's three and a half years studying in university, and it's the first degree of law. Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. 2000? You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? Q. Did you practice law in Israel? Q. Did you practice law in Israel? A. No. I did my law training – after I studied law in Tel 22 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 23 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; I continue studying. Page 6 A. An Inter – since eight years old. I twas born in France, and at eight, I arrived with my family. Q. You speak like you're French. A. Yeah? I am French. A. Yeah? I am French. Q. It it's okay; I just A. Yeah? I am French. Q. Uh-huh. Have you – do you teach at a university? A. Yes, several universities, yeah. Page 8 A. No. it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil – but criminal division. A. Yeah, civilian court, or a military court? A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. A. No. it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil – but criminal law. A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. A. Yeah,	12	A. Yeah.	12	called Chalizhut, human resources. And I was based in
in university, and it's the first degree of law. Q. All right, thank you. That's helpful to me. You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? A. Yeah. Q. Did you grow up in Israel? A. A. After - since eight years old. I was born in France, and at eight, I arrived with my family. Q. You speak like you're French. A. Yeah 21 and French. A. Yeah 22 You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? A. Yeah. A. No. I did my law training - after I studied law in Tel 21 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 22 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; I continue studying. Page 6 Page 6 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. Q. Ush that a civilian court, or a military court? A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil - but criminal law. A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Civilian - A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Cand did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the expert in court and speak to the judges? A. No, it were because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the fless with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor rever big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these 20 of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these 21 cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was — I mean, three different years — three time — I mean, three different years — three time — I mean, three different years — three time — I mean, three different years — three time — I mean, three different years — three time — I mean, three different years — three time — I mean, three different years — three time — I mean, three diffe	13		13	the Navy, so I was in an office in Haifa, of the Navy.
16 Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me. You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 18 2000? 19 A. Yeah. 20 Q. Did you practice law in Israel? 21 A. No. I did my law training after I studied law in Tel 22 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 23 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 24 I continue studying. 25 Q. Where did you do your training? 26 Q. Where did you do your training? 27 A. A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal 28 division. 3 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 3 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 4 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal 4 law. 6 Q. Civilian 7 A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. 8 Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv 9 District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court 10 and speak to the judges? 11 A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. 12 Q. Magistrate court? 13 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor rever big cases of or pae and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 20 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with the prosecutor of the due process right in the military courts? think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 21 Yeah. 22 A. Yeah. 23 Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with the prosecutor of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with	14	A. It's the first it's three and a half years studying	14	It's because I lived quite close, so I was, like,
You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year 2000? A Yeah. Q Did you practice law in Israel? A No. I did my law training - after I studied law in Tel 2 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; I continue studying. Page 6 A In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. Q Is that a civilian court, or a military court? A No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil - but criminal law. Q Crivitian - A Yeah, 20 Un-huh. Page 8 A No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil - but criminal law. Q Crivitian - A Yeah, 20 Un-huh. Page 8 Q Dand did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A No, we - because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the 19 cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of ape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A No, it is a No, it did my law training, and then I did the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; A Yeah, and then yeaped in court of the law, military courts that the specific topic was the issue of HL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with the class in Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. A Yeah. Alter — since ight, larvied with my famility. A Yeah, and then year training, and then I did when I day you peated that lecture for thre	15	in university, and it's the first degree of law.	15	working in the office there.
18 2000? A Yeah. Q Did you practice law in Israel? A No. I did my law training — after I studied law in Tel 22 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 23 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; I Continue studying. Page 6 A Yeah. A I I tontinue studying. Page 6 A I A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. A In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. A I I shat a civilian court, or a military court? A No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal law. D C Civilian — A Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. A No, we — because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the Bies with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, or amilitary courts thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. A Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the — the postecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A No, it is Tel Aviv and the tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time — I mean, three different years — three time— three in — when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have spec	16	Q. All right; thank you. That's helpful to me.	16	Q. Did you grow up in Israel?
19 A. Yeah. 20 Q. Did you practice law in Israel? 21 A. No. I did my law training — after I studied law in Tel 22 Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 23 the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 24 I continue studying. 25 Q. Where did you do your training? 26 Q. Where did you do your training? 27 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal 28 division. 29 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 4 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal 5 law. 6 Q. Civilian — 6 A. Yeah. 8 Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv 9 District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court 10 and speak to the judges? 11 A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the minor offenses. 17 Q. Magistrate court? 18 A. Yeah. 19 Q. You speak like you're French. 20 A. Yeah. 2 Q. It it's okay; I just 21 A. Yeah. 22 Yeah. 23 Q. Uh-huh. 24 Have you — do you teach at a university? 24 A. Yes, several universities, yeah. 25 Q. Do you teach any classes about the Israeli military courts? 3 A. So — currently, at that moment, no; but I did — when I was — sorry, I — Q. That's okay. 4 A. When I was at — I was teaching at Tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time — I mean, three different years — three years; I'm almost sure it's three. 20 And — but here in — when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically — maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. 21 Geneva, I don't have specifically — maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. 22 Q. Did — was your — what was the class in Tel Aviv that — at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. 23 Q. And you repeated tha	17	You were admitted to the Israeli Bar in the year	17	A. After since eight years old. I was born in France,
20. Did you practice law in Israel? 21. A. No. 1 did my law training — after I studied law in Tel 22. Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did 23. the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; 24. I continue studying. 25. Q. Where did you do your training? 26. Where did you do your training? 27. A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal 28. division. 39. Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 40. A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal 41. I law. 42. Q. Do you teach any classes about the Israeli military courts? 43. A. So — currently, at that moment, no; but I did — when I law. 44. — when I was at — I was teaching at Tel Aviv 45. Q. A. — when I was at — I was teaching at Tel Aviv 46. A. — when I was at — I was teaching at Tel Aviv 47. University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts of the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of mor offenses. 49. A. No, it's Tel Aviv Court; oriyl first instance court, or rather minor offenses. 40. A. No, we — because we are not yet lawyer, right? So we the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of minor offenses. 40. District Court, only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. 41. A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the — the cases. 42. Q. Magistrate court? 43. A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the — the cases. 44. Thave you — do you teach at a university? 45. A. Yeah. 46. A. Yeah. 47. A. Yeah. 48. A. Yeah. 49. Do you teach any classes about the Israeli military courts? 40. So — currently, at that moment, no; but I did — when I was — sorry, I — 40. Vasa — sorry, I — 41. That's okay. 40. A. Weah. But he prosecutor were incourt and speak to the judges? 41. A. No, we — because we are not yet lawyer, right? So we may to the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of mark prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 41. A. No, it was — I went for the file with the lass in Tel Aviv Univer	18	2000?	18	and at eight, I arrived with my family.
Ai. No. I did my law training — after I studied law in Tel Aiv University, I did one year training, and then I did the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; I continue studying. Q. Where did you do your training? Page 6 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil — but criminal law. Q. Civilian — A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Civilian — A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Ayeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Civilian — A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Civilian — A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Civilian — A. No, we — because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the — the cases I was working with the prosecutor rwere big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with District Court; only first instance court, or rather of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with	19	A. Yeah.	19	Q. You speak like you're French.
Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; I continue studying. Page 6 Page 6 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal law. A. Yeah, civilian A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Civilian A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv possibility and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, out not the bistrict Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	20	Q. Did you practice law in Israel?	20	A. Yeah? I am French.
the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced; I continue studying. Page 6 A. Where did you do your training? Page 6 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil – but criminal but a courts? A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Civilian – A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we — because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, our their minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the — the cases I was working with the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. No, it was — I mean, the prosecutor I was working with Page 6 A. Yes, several universities, yeah. Page 8 A. Yes, currently, at that moment, no; but I did — when I was — I was teach any classes about the Israeli military courts? A. So — currently, at that moment, no; but I did — when I was — I was teaching at Tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courts on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time — I mean, three different years — three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And — but here in — I mean, three different years — three years; I'm almost sure it's three. Gen	21	A. No. I did my law training after I studied law in Tel	21	Q. It it's okay; I just
24 Have you do you teach at a university?	22	Aviv University, I did one year training, and then I did	22	A. Yeah.
Page 6 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal law. Q. Civilian A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. Civilian A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. A. Yeah, civilian court, or an ilitary courts of I was sorry, I C. That's okay. A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. To Q. That's okay. A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. To Q. That's okay. A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. To Q. That's okay. A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. To Q. That's okay. A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. To Q. That's okay. A. Yeah, and then the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years - three years: I malmost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. Yeah, Eutan Lawa the class in Tel Aviv University system? A. Yeah But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big	23	the exam at the Bar, but I have not practiced;	23	Q. Uh-huh.
Page 6 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal law. G. Civilian A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv loistrict Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of the files with prosecutor; or rather files with prosecutor? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases on eyear of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with the class about the Israeli military courts? A. So - currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I Q. That's okay. A. So - currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I Q. That's okay. A. A when I was at I was teaching at Tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military courts system? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases Or frape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I bel	24	I continue studying.	24	Have you do you teach at a university?
1 A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal division. 2 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 3 Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? 4 A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal law. 5 Q. Civilian 7 A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. 9 Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? 11 A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of minor offenses. 12 Q. Magistrate court? 13 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 2 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 2 Do you teach any classes about the Israeli military courts? 3 A. So currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was atI was teaching at Tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts three timeI mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. 10 And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. 15 Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? 16 IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 16 Yeah. 17 Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? 28 A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	25	Q. Where did you do your training?	25	A. Yes, several universities, yeah.
division. Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal I was sorry, I Q. That's okay. A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of bistrict Court; only first instance court, or rather District Court; only first instance court, or rather Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with a. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with District Court; only first instance court, or rather or appear and whatever, but we didn't appear in these Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with District Court; only first instance court I was working with District Court; only first instance court, or rather a. Yeah. District Court; only first instance court, or rather a. Yeah. B. Courts? A. So, currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I D. That's okay. A. A when I was at I was teaching at Tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts B. A when I was at I was teaching at Tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts we went even, with the class, to the military courts we went even, with the class, to the military courts we went even, with there im I mean, three different years? A when I was at I was te I was te		Page 6		Page 8
Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court? A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal law. Q. Civilian A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather District Court; only first instance court, or rather District Court; only first instance court, or rather A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor I was working with A. Yeah. But really minor offenses during? A. No, it was I mean, three moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I D. Vasay. A. So currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I D. Vasay. A. So currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I D. Vasay. A. So currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I D. Vasay. A. So currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I D. Vasay. A. So currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I D. Vasay. A. So currently, at that moment, no; but I did when I was sorry, I D. Vasay. A. No, it was I was teaching at Tel Aviv University, and there, I had specific courses on this; we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and	1	A. In the prosecutor office in Tel Aviv, the criminal	1	Q. Do you teach any classes about the Israeli military
A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal 1	2	division.	2	courts?
5	3	Q. Is that a civilian court, or a military court?	3	A. So currently, at that moment, no; but I did when
6 Q. Civilian 7 A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. 8 Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv 9 District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court 10 and speak to the judges? 11 A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we 12 are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on 13 the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of 14 thing. And then we appear in court, but not the 15 District Court; only first instance court, or rather 16 minor offenses. 17 Q. Magistrate court? 18 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the 19 cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases 20 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your 21 one year of training? 22 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 25 University, and there, I had specific courses on this; 26 Wuniversity, and there, I had specific courses on this; 27 Wuniversity, and there, I had specific courses on this; 28 we went even, with the class, to the military courts 29 three time I mean, three different years three 29 years; I'm almost sure it's three. 20 And but here in when I teach in Paris, or 21 Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are 22 mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occurt, or was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the 21 Israeli military court system? 22 A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due 23 process right in the military courts. I think on this 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with	4	A. No, it's Tel Aviv District Court, civil but criminal	4	I was sorry, I
7 A. Yeah, civilian and criminal matters, yeah. 8 Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv 9 District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court 10 and speak to the judges? 11 A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we 12 are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on 13 the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of 14 thing. And then we appear in court, but not the 15 District Court; only first instance court, or rather 16 minor offenses. 17 Q. Magistrate court? 18 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the 19 cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases 20 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your 21 A. No, it was I mean, three different years three 22 years; I'm almost sure it's three. 23 University, and there, I had specific courses on this; 24 We went even, with the class, to the military courts 25 we went even, with the class, to the military courts 26 we went even, with the class, to the military courts 27 University, and there, I had specific courses on this; 28 we went even, with the class, to the military courts 40 three time I mean, three different years three 41 years; I'm almost sure it's three. 42 A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we 43 and but here in when I teach in Paris, or 44 and but here in when I teach in Paris, or 45 Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are 46 mention, you know, as a part of the law, military 47 occupation. 48 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the 49 Is a lawyer what was the class in Tel Aviv 40 that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the 41 Israeli military court system? 42 A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of 43 I lend to I think the specific lecture of two hours. 44 Yeah. 45 Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? 46 A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	5	law.	5	Q. That's okay.
Q. And did you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your and speak to the judges? 10 years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	6	Q. Civilian	6	A when I was at I was teaching at Tel Aviv
District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. District Court; only first instance court, or rather that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	7	•	7	
and speak to the judges? 1 A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we 12 are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on 13 the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of 14 thing. And then we appear in court, but not the 15 District Court; only first instance court, or rather 16 minor offenses. 17 Q. Magistrate court? 18 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the 19 cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases 20 of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these 21 cases. 22 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your 23 one year of training? 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 25 we work on 26 Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are 27 mention, you know, as a part of the law, military 28 occupation. 29 Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv 29 that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the 20 IIIL and human rights, and the question of the due 20 process right in the military courts. I think on this 21 concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 20 Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? 21 A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	8	O And did you as part of your work in the Tel Aviv		University, and there, I had specific courses on this;
A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with I believe in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe		Q. And the you, as part of your work in the Tel Aviv	8	ž <u>-</u>
are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with District Court; only first instance court, or rather coccupation. District Court; only first instance court, or rather coccupation. District Court; only first instance court, or rather coccupation. District Court; only first instance court, or rather coccupation. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe		District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court		we went even, with the class, to the military courts
the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of coccupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe		District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges?	9	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three
thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? Q. Did you repeated that lecture for three years? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with	10 11	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we	9 10	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or
District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. 16 minor offenses. 16 minor offenses. 17 Q. Magistrate court? 18 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 20 Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 21 District Court; only first instance court, or rather that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? 21 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 22 Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? 23 A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 25 Q. Did you repeated that lecture for three years? 26 A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	10 11 12	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on	9 10 11 12	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are
minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	10 11 12 13	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of	9 10 11 12 13	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military
Q. Magistrate court? 18 A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases 19 of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 20 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? 21 One year of training? 22 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 23 I sraeli military court system? 24 A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 25 A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 25 Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? 26 A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	10 11 12 13 14	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the	9 10 11 12 13 14	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation.
A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this 21	10 11 12 13 14 15	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather	9 10 11 12 13 14	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv
cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	10 11 12 13 14 15	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the
of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. 2	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system?
cases. 21 I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. 22 Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your 23 one year of training? 24 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 25 Yeah. 26 Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? 27 A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of
Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due
one year of training? 2 Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? 2 A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 2 A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this
A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with 24 A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours.
, 1	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah.
And the time the state of the work of the state of the st	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years?
25 her, she was let's say specialty was sexual assault 25 I did, yeah, or maybe two years. I don't remember,	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	District Court, as a trainee, did you appear in court and speak to the judges? A. No, we because we are not yet lawyer; right? So we are "stagiaire," they call it in Israel; so we work on the files with prosecutor; we help in this kind of thing. And then we appear in court, but not the District Court; only first instance court, or rather minor offenses. Q. Magistrate court? A. Yeah. But really minor offenses. Because the the cases I was working with the prosecutor were big cases of rape and whatever, but we didn't appear in these cases. Q. Did you work on any security-related matters during your one year of training? A. No, it was I mean, the prosecutor I was working with	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	we went even, with the class, to the military courts three time I mean, three different years three years; I'm almost sure it's three. And but here in when I teach in Paris, or Geneva, I don't have specifically maybe there are mention, you know, as a part of the law, military occupation. Q. Did was your what was the class in Tel Aviv that at Tel Aviv University that dealt with the Israeli military court system? A. I need to I think the specific topic was the issue of IHL and human rights, and the question of the due process right in the military courts. I think on this I concentrate to one specific lecture of two hours. Yeah. Q. And you repeated that lecture for three years? A. I think so. I need to check the syllabus, but I believe

	Page 9		Page 11
1 .	yeah.	1	Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the UN
2	Q. Other than the lecture that's part of the class that you	2	Convention Against Torture. So you had the
3	described and first of all, do I have it right that	3	international convention; then you had conventions on
4	the class was a full semester class?	4	regional level, like the European Convention. Then you
5	A. Yes.	5	have decision of different courts.
6	Q. And what was the title of the class?	6	Q. So in a sort of a supernutshell, international human
7	A. Do you mean in Tel Aviv?	7	rights law could be thought of as like protecting basic
8	Q. Yeah.	8	human rights in any circumstance?
9	A. The class in Tel Aviv that I did?	9	A. Exactly.
10	Q. Yes.	10	Q. War, non-war; doesn't matter. Right?
11	A. It was "The Law of Military Occupation and its	11	A. Mm-hmm yes.
12	Application by the Israeli High Court of Justice." This	12	Q. Okay.
13	was the title, I think. It's an optional course.	13	Now, is part of the other well, first of all,
14	Q. And so what what kinds of topics did it cover?	14	other than the lecture you've described from the course
15	A. Many topics. Every lecture was a different topic. And	15	that you taught about the occupation in Tel Aviv
16	it was all related to the occupation the Israeli	16	University, have you done other teaching about the
17	occupation. So you have one class, for example, on	17	Israeli military court system?
18	targeted killing; one class on legislation power; one	18	A. No.
19	class you know.	19	Q. And you have published some articles
20	Q. Different things?	20	A. Mm-hmm.
21	A. Different yeah, different topics.	21	Q about the Israeli military court system; right?
22	Q. And one of the one of the lectures was dedicated to	22	A. Yes.
23	the Israeli military courts?	23	Q. I think I I read an article called "The Judicial Arm
24	A. Yeah. I think it was at the part of IHL and human	24	of the Occupation," or something like that.
25	rights, yeah. And the right of due process, yeah.	25	A. I'm happy you read it.
	Page 10		Page 12
1	Q. So can I just ask you about IHL and HRL. So "IHL"	1	Q. And sadly I didn't pay for it, or you would
2	stands for "international humanitarian law"; is that	2	A. Pay?
3	right?	3	Q get a royalty yeah.
4	A. Yeah.	4	A. I have not I don't have any
5	Q. And sometimes that's referred to as the law of war?	5	Q. And then and then there was another I think
6	A. Mm-hmm.	6	a chapter of a book that I read recently called
7	Q. Is that correct?	7	"Reframing the Legality"
8	A. Mm-hmm.	8	A. Yeah.
9	Q. So you have to say "yes," or "no," or	9	Q "of the Israeli Military Courts"?
10	A. Sorry: Yes.	10	A. Yeah.
11	Q some word	11	Q. Is that a more recent publication?
12	A. Yes. Yes. Yes.	12	A. Yeah, this is from 2011.
13	Q for Fiona.	13	Q. Is there anything else that you've published that
14	Okay. And that's like the Geneva Fourth Geneva	14	touches on those topics, the topic of the Israeli
15	Convention and the Fourth Hague Convention, and that	15	military court system?
16	that's sort of the field of IHL?	16	A. So there is one article that is going to be published on
17	A. Yeah. There's other laws, also, but these are the main	17	9th December, so like, it's very soon; in two weeks.
18	conventions, you can say.	18	It's about torture, so I believe it's linked, more or
19	Q. And then human rights law is a different thing; right?	19	less. So there is this article I think you received
20	A. A different branch of law, yeah.	20	this as well; right? I think so.
21	Q. A different branch of law. And that's what are some	21	Q. I think I did.
22	of the main sources of that legal field?	22	A. Yeah. Yeah.
23	A. Human rights law?	23	Q. Right. Did we I think we received that.
24	Q. Yes.	24	A. Yeah.
25	A. So you have the UN conventions, the International	25	MR. YALOWITZ: You sent that to us; right?

	Page 13		Page 15
1 .	MR. HILL: For the record, you recently requested it, and	1	So what sorry, you asked me what was the ?
2	I did send it to you.	2	Q. What was the research?
3	A. Yeah.	3	A. What was the research? So I the question of my
4	MR. YALOWITZ: I thought you did. Thank you for thank	4	research was the question of jurisdiction of the
5	you for that, both of you.	5	military courts.
6	A. And so this now I'm going to publish the book, and	6	Q. And you attended some military court hearings in
7	it's not specifically on the Israeli military courts;	7	connection with that work; is that right?
8	it's on national courts in general. But there are some	8	A. I attended some hearing. Actually, what I did, I in
9	passages related to the military court.	9	order to conduct the research, I studied the
10	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	10	legislation which is, by the way, not that evident,
11	Q. All right. And is that book in prepublication? How far	11	because you know, the order is amended quite
12	along is it?	12	frequently, and it was quite difficult to find the
13	A. It will be published on the 6th of March. I have the	13	relevant legislation for the relevant time.
14	date.	14	So I looked for the legislation; I read a number of
15	Q. That's exciting. So you're still work on the galleys	15	case law; I went to the military court. Yeah.
16	and proofs and things like that?	16	Q. You spoke with Judge Shaul Gordon?
17	A. I sent the proofs.	17	A. Gordon, yeah.
18	Q. Outstanding.	18	Q. And I think I asked about your notes of your
19	A. Yeah.	19	conversation with him, but you didn't have them; is that
20	Q. Well, we'll keep an eye out for it when it's published.	20	right?
21	This one, we can we can purchase.	21	A. I don't have them now. I did that for the thesis,
22	A. Yes.	22	and
23	Q. All right.	23	Q. I see.
24	A. This one you will need to pay.	24	A it's part of the research then. I don't think I kept
25	Q. Very good.	25	notes since then.
	Page 14		Page 16
1	Page 14 So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm	1	Page 16 Q. It's been some time?
1 2		1 2	
	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and		Q. It's been some time?A. Yeah.Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you
2	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like	2	Q. It's been some time?A. Yeah.Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that?
2 3 4 5	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also?	2	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the
2 3 4 5 6	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not.	2 3 4	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of
2 3 4 5 6 7	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." You have it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all the academic material that was available at that time,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." You have it before you; right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all the academic material that was available at that time, and also and joint press report, which was quite
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." You have it before you; right? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all the academic material that was available at that time, and also and joint press report, which was quite restrained. There weren't a lot of publication at that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." You have it before you; right? A. Yes. Q. And you you published this in 2007?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all the academic material that was available at that time, and also and joint press report, which was quite restrained. There weren't a lot of publication at that time. And in this footnote here, I mention more or less
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." You have it before you; right? A. Yes. Q. And you you published this in 2007? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all the academic material that was available at that time, and also and joint press report, which was quite restrained. There weren't a lot of publication at that time. And in this footnote here, I mention more or less what was available, in footnote number 1.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." You have it before you; right? A. Yes. Q. And you you published this in 2007? A. Yes. Q. What research did you do for this article?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all the academic material that was available at that time, and also and joint press report, which was quite restrained. There weren't a lot of publication at that time. And in this footnote here, I mention more or less what was available, in footnote number 1. And you can see that it wasn't very, very it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." You have it before you; right? A. Yes. Q. And you you published this in 2007? A. Yes. Q. What research did you do for this article? A. Oh, the article is a smaller version of my master thesis	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all the academic material that was available at that time, and also and joint press report, which was quite restrained. There weren't a lot of publication at that time. And in this footnote here, I mention more or less what was available, in footnote number 1. And you can see that it wasn't very, very it's not all the bibliography of my thesis, but there weren't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So so maybe I'll ask you about the judicial arm of the occupation; I have a few questions about that. Why don't we why don't we look at it together, and I'll give you a copy by the way, would you like a copy of your report also? A. Yeah, sure, why not. Q. Yeah. MR. YALOWITZ: Why don't we mark both of those. So we'll mark, as Weill deposition exhibit 1, your report; and we'll mark as Weill deposition exhibit number 2 a copy of your article, "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." (Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So I was going to ask you about the article, which is "The Judicial Arm of the Occupation." You have it before you; right? A. Yes. Q. And you you published this in 2007? A. Yes. Q. What research did you do for this article?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. It's been some time? A. Yeah. Q. All right. So anything else? Did you did you read any trial transcripts, or anything like that? A. For the research of the the article, so I read the I read mainly cases. I it was less transcript of cases, although I imagine I read a few; but you know, I read cases that started from '67, so it's not necessarily that you have access to the to the transcript. Then I was discussing also with defense lawyer and prosecutor. But transcript, as such, I don't remember reading maybe one or two. Not more. Q. You A. And then sorry. And then of course I read also all the academic material that was available at that time, and also and joint press report, which was quite restrained. There weren't a lot of publication at that time. And in this footnote here, I mention more or less what was available, in footnote number 1. And you can see that it wasn't very, very it's

25

very much material --

25

a publication based on that research.

	Page 17		Page 19
1	A. Publications, yeah.	1	administration of justice'."
2	Q. All right.	2	And you're you're relying for that statement on
3	A. Yeah.	3	Article 64 of the Fourth Geneva Convention; do I have
4	Q. I noticed you mentioned a thing called collection of	4	that right?
5	proclamations, orders, and appointments of the military	5	A. Yes.
6	commander in the West Bank region.	6	Q. And that that statement is a correct statement of
7	A. Yeah, this is sorry. This is the official gazette,	7	applicable law today as well; right?
8	we can call it, yeah, for the military orders.	8	The statement I read is correct; right?
9	Q. How did you find it?	9	A. The statement what do you mean? The article, if the
10	A. In the law library. But you know, you have one shelf	10	article is correct today?
11	with classes, so starting from '67, and then you have	11	Q. Well, the sentence let me break it down.
12	all the orders in chronologic issue; you know? So in	12	A. Yeah. Okay.
13	order to try to understand it's very complicated.	13	Q. Okay. So so I read you a sentence
14	So you have this official gazette there, and it stop	14	A. Can you just tell me where you start the sentence? I
15	at sometimes, so you don't have everything; it's not	15	you know
16	very completed, it what was at the university. These	16	Q. Sure. I'm so sorry.
17	these where I saw the gazette. Yeah.	17	A. No, no.
18	Q. Do you do you your article noted, and I think you	18	Q. So do you see footnote 10?
19	mentioned	19	A. Yes, I see it, yeah.
20	A. Mm-hmm.	20	Q. Do you see the reference to footnote 10? It's in the
21	Q that the military courts you were studying were first	21	second paragraph.
22	constituted in 1967; is that right?	22	A. Yeah.
23	A. Yes.	23	Q. So that's the sentence I read.
24	Q. And have they been in session ever since?	24	A. The "intervention," yeah.
25	A. Yes.	25	Q. So what you're describing there is the application of
	Page 18		Page 20
1	Q. They're not sort of nobody is tried, in a one-shot	1	Article 64 of the Fourth Geneva Convention; right?
2	court; right? You know what I mean by that?	2	A. Mm-hmm.
3	A. No, no. They are well how to say they are since	3	Q. You have to
4	1967, exactly.	4	A. Yes.
5	Q. Well established?	5	Q. And you described it in 2007, but it's it's still
6	A. Long established.	6	correct today, that description of
7	Q. Long established?	7	A. Yes, the article yes.
8	A. "Well," I don't know; but "long."	8	Q. And and the article Article 64 was in effect in
9	Q. Fair enough. "Long established"; right?	9	1967; right?
10	A. Right.	10	A. Right.
11	Q. Do you know what the basis under Israeli law for the	11	Q. And has remained in effect ever since; right?
12	establishment of the court in 1967 was?	12	A. Exactly.
13	A. Yeah, the proclamation order.	13	Q. Okay. And so just to narrow our focus to security,
14	Q. And and is that has that proclamation order ever	14	certainly legislation and judicial administration in the
15	been challenged under the law of Israel?	15	military courts, for reasons of protecting security of
16	A. No. As far as I know.	16	the State of Israel, you would agree, is appropriate for
17	Q. Now, you said in the article that and I'm looking at	17	the military courts?
18	page 398 you said:	18	MR. SATIN: Objection as to
19	"Intervention by the occupying power in the local	19	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
20	administration of justice is authorized only for reasons	20	Q. Do I have that right?
21	of security, for the application of the Convention"	21	MR. SATIN: Objection as to vague.
22	and by that, I think you were referring to the Fourth	22	You can answer.
23	Geneva Convention?	23	WITNESS: I can answer?
24	A. Exactly.	24	A. When I refer to Article 64, or any article that is
25	Q. " and for 'the necessity for ensuring the effective	25	related to the law of military occupation, we have to

	Page 21		Page 23
1	remind that they were draft for occupation; and at that	1	humanitarian law really isn't designed to answer the
2	time, the drafting of the convention in 1949, occupation	2	question whether an occupation should continue, how
3	was seen as a transit situation, a temporary situation.	3	a conflict should be resolved; it doesn't answer those
4	And therefore, during this time, as it's stipulated in	4	larger questions. Right?
5	this article, you could have some authorities related to	5	A. You have some provision, like Article 47, saying that if
6	legislation and to judicial enforcement and to	6	there have been, for example, an annexation, then still
7	execution, in order to safeguard the order and security	7	the rights, as defined by the Geneva Convention, are
8	for this short time that you are governing there.	8	applicable.
9	So there wasn't I mean, I think that when the	9	And then you have, of course, other branches of
10	Geneva Convention was drafted, no one had expected that	10	law as public international law, the right to
11	this law will govern during 45 years. So this is	11	self-determination, the nonacquirement of territory by
12	something that we must remember when we are dealing with		force that are similarly applicable.
13	the law of military occupation.	13	Q. So
14	Q. You had a French phrase that you used to describe that	14	A. And then they will have a stand about the illegality of
15	concept that you just said which I'll mangle, because	15	an occupation.
16	my French is very bad but you said (French spoken),	16	Q. Things like public international law might speak to
17	something like that	17	that?
18	A. What? I can't understand your French.	18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Yeah. Lucy will read it.	19	Q. Do you think that Articles 64 and 66 speak to the
20	MS. McMILLAN: (French spoken.)	20	legality of an occupation?
21	A. (French spoken.)	21	A. No, it gives the it grant the authority to establish
22	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	22	military court and provide legislation.
23	Q. What does that mean?	23	Q. All right. And Article 64 also gives the authority to
24	A. "Nothing lasts as the temporary."	24	the military to establish legislation relating to
25	Q. So and I think you've written about what you just	25	security around the conflict; is that fair to say?
	Page 22		Page 24
1	said about temporary versus long term	1	A. Right, yeah, it provides a bit more detail that were
2	A. Mm-hmm.	2	of Article 43 of the regulation.
3	Q that was the subject of your article, "Reframing the	3	Q. All right. Now, you would you agree with me that
4	Legality of the Israeli Military Courts on the West	4	the that under the under Article 64, the military
5	Bank"; right?	5	government centralizes judicial, legislative and
6	A. Yes, with other issues, yeah.	6	executive powers?
7	Q. And I think that one of the arguments you made was	7	MR. SATIN: Objection, compound question.
8	that was that I'm not seeing it here; bear with me	8	You can answer.
9	one second.	9	A. Yeah. I didn't can you repeat this? I didn't
10	A. Yeah, sure.	10	understand very well.
11	Q. I'm not seeing it here, but let me try to explain what I	11	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
12	what I'm curious about.	12	Q. Sure. No, no, that's okay; bear with me. I'm going to
13	You described international humanitarian law as	13	try to get it just right.
14	governing the process of the administration of a	14	In an occupation, under Article 64 of the Fourth
15	military court system in occupation?	15	Geneva Convention, the military government centralizes
16	A. "Process"? What do you mean by "process"?	16	in its hands all government powers: The legislative,
17	Q. So like, it regulates the conduct of the trials, or	17	judiciary, and enforcement authorities?
18	it regulates the conduct of the courts, and so forth.	18	A. The military government centralize all these powers, and
19	It doesn't it doesn't address the legality of the	19	it is beyond, also, Article 64, as you first asked me
20	occupation itself, which is really a political question.	20	how the courts were created, and I told you it's a
21	Does that was that you who wrote that?	21	proclamation order. So you see, it's the military
22	A. The IHL is IHL more in generally; not only relating	22	commander that is legislating. It established the
23	to the military court is relating how to administrate	23	courts, it created the law that will be in force there,
	·		and of course it's also the enforcement authority.
24	an occupation.	24	and of course it's also the emoleciment authority.
24 25	an occupation. Q. Right. And that it really doesn't international	25	Yeah.

	Page 25		Page 27
1	Q. And in fact, I think you would agree with me that Israel	1	Q. All right. And your you had them to use as you saw
2	is actually forbidden from extending its own legal	2	fit for the purposes of your report?
3	system to the West Bank; right?	3	A. Yeah.
4	A. It is forbidden, and unfortunately, it does so for the	4	Q. Okay. And you understand all the defendants were
5	settlements.	5	Palestinian residents; right?
6	Q. So but but yes, it's forbidden to do that; right?	6	A. Mm-hmm yes.
7	Israel couldn't establish civilian courts in the West	7	Q. Okay. Would it have been appropriate under IHL, in your
8	Bank to try Palestinians for security crimes; right?	8	opinion, for the State of Israel to have established
9	A. Israel couldn't establish civilian court ?	9	a civilian criminal court, say in Ramallah, staffed by
10	Q. In the West Bank.	10	citizens of Israel, non-military, to try criminal cases
11	A. What do you mean by "civilian court"? That you will	11	like the 21 that we're here to discuss?
12	you will have civilian judging the person?	12	A. Yeah. I think the question is not whether the judges
13	Q. Right.	13	are wearing are military or civilian; it's the
14	A. I think it could. Why not?	14	question of the structure of the court, to be
15	Q. So, for example, you know in our case here, there	15	nonpolitical and to be competent court, to be
16	were 21 convictions of Palestinians for security crimes.	16	independent. And then the applicable law will safeguard
17	You you read those files; right?	17	the basics rule of due process.
18	A. I admit I didn't really read them, because it was	18	This is the requirement. Then, how you really do
19	very I received them, but I didn't have I just	19	it, it's a it can be you know, it can vary. But
20	you know, look in them very briefly, yeah. So I can't	20	these are the requirements.
21	recall the facts, or you know.	21	Q. So so in your judgment, the there would not be
22 23	Q. All right.	22	a problem establishing a civilian court to apply Israeli
23 24	A. Yeah.Q. Counsel for the Palestinian Authority gave you those	24	law in the West Bank? A. I'm not sure if I understand what you mean, "civilian."
25	files to use as you thought might be relevant for your	25	If it is the State of Israel establishing it?
			-
	Page 26		Page 28
1	opinions; is that fair to say?	1	Q. Yes.
2	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation.	2	A. No. The State of Israel cannot establish a court in the
3	You can answer.	3	occupied territory. Is this what you mean by saying
4	A. Sorry, I your if it was no. Yeah.	4	"a civilian court"? Q. That's what I meant by saying "a civilian court."
5 6	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. Okay. Counsel	5 6	A. So if this is the meaning of the word "civilian court,"
7	Q. Okay. Counsel A. Yeah.	7	like a court established by the State, so it's
8	Q. You were hired by counsel for the Palestinian	8	impossible, because the military commander is the
9	Authority	9	legislative authority in the Occupied Territory.
10	A. Right.	10	Q. That's what I thought you would think. Okay. I think
11	Q right? And and the PLO?	11	we understand each other now.
12	A. Mm-hmm.	12	A. Okay.
13	Q. Is that right?	13	Q. I say "civilian" to contrast with "military." So
14	You have to say "yes" or "no."	14	military courts are under the military commander;
15	A. Yes.	15	civilian courts are nonmilitary courts, established by
16	Q. Okay. And and that's was that Mr. Satin or	16	the State of Israel.
17	Mr. Hill?	17	A. By the State, okay. So if this is a okay.
18	Who hired you?	18	Q. Sorry for the confusion.
19	A. Mr. Hill.	19	A. So we understand yeah.
20	Q. Mr. Hill?	20	Q. Okay, excellent.
21	Who hired you?	21	Now, did you read enough of the 21
22	A. Mr. Hill.	22	A. And by the way, can I just add something?
23	Q. Mr. Hill. Okay. And Mr. Hill sent you those files;	23	Q. Please.
24	right?	24	A. What is astonishing is that they established civilian
25	A. I I've received these files, yeah.	25	court, this kind of court, in the settlements; right?
			7 (Pages 25 to 28)

	Page 29		Page 31
1 .	Q. So	1	with the Fourth Geneva Convention; is that fair to say?
2	A. Okay, but this is	2	A. I think I think that the reason the military courts
3	Q. So our case isn't isn't about any of those courts;	3	were established because you don't have any
4	fair to say?	4	obligation to establish them, so I think that the
5	A. No, without fair enough, yeah.	5	obligation was and I've read this in the Yesh Din
6	Q. Okay. So did you did you read enough of the 21 case	6	report, there are sitting Shamgar that was part of
7	files to understand that these were all cases of people	7	the the ones that established the military court,
8	accused of security crimes?	8	saying that they needed this court to handle security
9	A. Yes, they are accused of security crime, I'm I know.	9	issue. And at that time, they were sure that the
10	Q. And do you agree with me that that's within the core	10	structure will be of short short how to say
11	competency of the military courts?	11	that it will operate for a short term.
12	A. Yes.	12	Q. "Short duration"?
13	Q. Did after you submitted your report	13	A. Yeah.
14	A. Mm-hmm.	14	Q. It was established to handle security matters; is that
15	Q we retained an individual named Daniel Reisner, to	15	what you're saying?
16	prepare a report and submit it to the lawyers for the	16	A. I believe so, yeah.
17	defendants. Did you have a chance to read that report?	17	Q. And is it your understanding that they that they made
18	A. Yes, I've read it.	18	an effort to model the courts on the Fourth Geneva
19	Q. And do you I take it you don't know Mr. Reisner	19	Convention and the US and UK manuals on how to comply
20	personally?	20	with the Fourth Geneva Convention?
21	A. Personally, no.	21	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation, and compound
22	Q. You've met, but quite briefly, I gather? Is that right?	22	question.
23	A. Yeah.	23	You can answer.
24	What what do you mean, we met?	24	A. (French spoken.) So the question was if they made
25	Q. I heard you met recently at a lecture	25	effort to comply with the Geneva Convention?
	Page 30		Page 32
1	Page 30	1	Page 32 BY MR. YALOWITZ:
1 2	A. I was	1 2	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
2	A. I was Q or something	2	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary.
2	A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he	2	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort.
2 3 4	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say 	2	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read
2	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon 	2 3 4	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She 	2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." 	2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. Do you know other than Israel and the West Bank, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. Do you know other than Israel and the West Bank, which is really the focus of our conversation today, are 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So would you please turn to page 10 of Mr. Reisner's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. Do you know other than Israel and the West Bank, which is really the focus of our conversation today, are there other places where military occupation courts have 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So would you please turn to page 10 of Mr. Reisner's report. I want to direct your attention to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. Do you know other than Israel and the West Bank, which is really the focus of our conversation today, are there other places where military occupation courts have been established and in compliance with well, let me 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So would you please turn to page 10 of Mr. Reisner's report. I want to direct your attention to paragraph 24.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. Do you know other than Israel and the West Bank, which is really the focus of our conversation today, are there other places where military occupation courts have been established and in compliance with well, let me ask it again; let me ask it a different way. I'll ask 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So would you please turn to page 10 of Mr. Reisner's report. I want to direct your attention to paragraph 24. A. Mm-hmm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. Do you know other than Israel and the West Bank, which is really the focus of our conversation today, are there other places where military occupation courts have been established and in compliance with well, let me ask it again; let me ask it a different way. I'll ask a background question first. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So would you please turn to page 10 of Mr. Reisner's report. I want to direct your attention to paragraph 24. A. Mm-hmm. Q. Is there anything in paragraph 24 that you disagree
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. Do you know other than Israel and the West Bank, which is really the focus of our conversation today, are there other places where military occupation courts have been established and in compliance with well, let me ask it again; let me ask it a different way. I'll ask a background question first. You understand that the when the Israel when 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So would you please turn to page 10 of Mr. Reisner's report. I want to direct your attention to paragraph 24. A. Mm-hmm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. I was Q or something A. No, no, I was in yes, I was in a conference, and he was saying Professor Kvechver yes, I'm how you say I give an expert opinion, and there is this Sharon Weill from Geneva. And then a friend of mine said, "She is here." This is how I remember. But I I didn't speak to him, and I don't know him personally at all. Q. Perhaps after the case you can you'll have a lot to discuss. A. I don't know. Q. All right. Did you did I ask you this? Did you read his report? A. I read, yes, of course. Q. Okay. Good. Do you know other than Israel and the West Bank, which is really the focus of our conversation today, are there other places where military occupation courts have been established and in compliance with well, let me ask it again; let me ask it a different way. I'll ask a background question first. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. That's a fair summary. A. I don't know if they made effort. Q. Well, I mean, did you read A. Yeah. Q the section of Reisner where he talks about the way that the Fourth Geneva Convention and the US and UK manuals were used to create the military court? Did you read that section of his report? Do you recall it? A. The report that I don't remember this part, no. Q. I'd better show it to you. A. Yeah. Maybe. Q. I'll show it to you. MR. YALOWITZ: All right. We'll mark as Weill 3 the expert report of Reisner. (Exhibit 3 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So would you please turn to page 10 of Mr. Reisner's report. I want to direct your attention to paragraph 24. A. Mm-hmm. Q. Is there anything in paragraph 24 that you disagree with?

	Page 33		Page 35
1	paragraph 25. Is there anything in paragraph 25 that	1	A. And then the Hague regulation, yeah, it's fine.
2	you disagree with?	2	Exactly. No problem, yeah.
3	A. While not strictly required under international law,	3	Q. You agree with paragraph 27?
4	what is I think that publication is required of	4	A. Yeah, yeah, absolutely. Yeah, yeah. I think
5	orders by military.	5	I mentioned this also in my expert opinion, the same.
6	Ah, the proclamation: Yes. Yes, and I think you	6	Yeah.
7	can also read the you can see also, this also reflect	7	Q. And if if I could also direct you to paragraph 28.
8	Article 43 of the Hague regulation, absolutely, yeah.	8	A. Yeah, it's like copying the article, yeah.
9	Q. So I probably should have given you a chance to read	9	Q. And you agree with paragraph 28; right?
10	article read paragraph 25 before I asked my question,	10	A. Exactly, yeah.
11	so let me ask it again.	11	Q. And I'd like you to review paragraph 29.
12	A. Yeah, sure.	12	A. Yeah, so
13	Q. You've read paragraph 25; right?	13	Q. Have you had a chance to review paragraph 29?
14	A. Mm-hmm.	14	A. Yes.
15	Q. You have to say	15	Q. Do you agree with it?
16	A. Yes, I've read it.	16	A. I would not say that a commander can change a law when
17	Q. And is there anything in paragraph 25 that you disagree	17	it feels you know, it's not a question of feeling;
18	with?	18	he's using the I mean, you know, the the article
19	A. Yes, I think there is a mistaken about the fact that	19	43 that we just spoke about was saying while "unless
20	you don't require publication of orders. Because once	20	absolutely prevented."
21	you do orders, you need to publish them. Now, you might	21	And similarly, the commentary of the Geneva
22	say that you don't need to issue an order to exercise an	22	Convention also are talking about real needs. So it's
23	occupation, because this is a de facto situation, and	23	not a feeling, but yes, let's say, when it's
24	this you don't need any law to say I'm now occupying or	24	absolutely prevented and there is a need. Yeah.
25	not; this is a question of fact.	25	Q. So I take it you'd make if you were editing
	Page 34		Page 36
1	But I don't agree that you don't need to publish	1	paragraph 29
2	orders once they are issued.	2	A. Yeah, I'm editing now the opinion of Reisner, yeah.
3	Q. So I think I see your criticism of paragraph 25.	3	Q. You would take out words "it feels"?
4	A. Yeah.	4	A. Okay, yeah. Let's say, yeah. "It feels" seems a bit
5	Q. Do I have it right that if you were rewriting or editing	5	not out of place, yeah.
6	paragraph 25, would you take out words "the publication	6	Q. And so you would read
7	of," and then it would be correct?	7	A. Because it should be an objective test, not a subjective
8	A. Yes.	8	one.
9	Q. Okay. Excellent.	9	Q. And there are two places where those words appear
10	I'd I'd like now to direct your attention to	10	A. Mm-hmm.
11	paragraph 26 of the Reisner report.	11	Q and you would take them out in both places; right?
12	A. Mm-hmm.	12	A. Mm-hmm. Yeah.
13	Q. If you just take a moment, and let me know when you've	13	Q. And then would you add some additional I think you
14	had a chance	14	just in fairness
15	A. Finished, yeah.	15	A. Yeah, I
16	Q to read that.	16	Q you added a sentence about
17	A. Yeah, exactly, this is the reflection of Article 43.	17	A. Unless absolutely prevented. This is Article 43; right?
18	Yes, absolutely, I know that proclamation.	18	Q. All right. Anything else on 29?
19	Q. All right. And do you	19	A. I no, I think it's fine.
20	A. I agree with this. This is what they said.	20	Q. All right.
21	Q. Outstanding.	21	Please look at article look at paragraph 30 with
22	I'd like to direct your attention to paragraph 27,	22	me.
23	and just let me know	23	A. Yeah.
24	A. Yeah.	24	Q. And let me know when you've had a chance to review it.
25	Q when you've had a chance	25	A. Yeah, I think it's fine.

	Page 37		Page 39
1	Q. You agree with paragraph 30?	1	A. Mm-hmm.
2	A. Mm-hmm.	2	Q. Anything else?
3	Q. You have to say	3	A. I think it's it's fine.
4	A. Yes, yes.	4	Q. Okay.
5	Q. All right.	5	Now, my would you look with me at paragraph 34.
6	And please review	6	A. Mm-hmm.
7	A. We continue here.	7	Q. In the first well, why don't you take a moment and
8	Q paragraph 31.	8	read paragraph 34.
9	We're not going to do the whole thing	9	A. Read, yes. Thank you.
10	A. Not all day, I hope.	10	Q. Sure.
11	Q I promise. I promise.	11	A. Yes, I I would agree. I would agree, really, but
12	But but just do look at paragraph 31.	12	only the last sentence, "and it established the
13	A. The UK one? From what date is the UK one? It's not	13	military court system"; I would omit "required."
14	written.	14	Q. Okay, thank you. That's helpful.
15	From '58.	15	All right. So I want to ask you, are there other
16	Q. It appears on paragraph 25 as 1958.	16	conflicts or occupations where a military court system
17	A. Yeah, I think it's it's really repeat Article 66.	17	has been established as contemplated in Article 66?
	· -		A. Not that I know.
18	Yeah, it's endorse Article 66, yeah.	18	
19 20	Q. And so if you could read paragraphs 32 and 33, that	19 20	Q. I want to ask you about sources of law A. Mm-hmm.
	would be helpful to me. Let me know when you've		
21	finished reading 32 and 33.	21	Q in the West Bank, which you describe on page 6 of
22	A. Yeah. I mean, again, you know, it's using a word that	22	your report.
23	is for example, at c:	23	A. Mm-hmm.
24	"Repeal and amend local laws and to legislate new	24	Q. Let's look together at page 6.
25	law, as necessitate by the exigenc[y] of the situation."	25	A. This is my report.
	Page 38		Page 40
1	Yes, but okay, so you have the convention that is	1	Q. Do you have it before you?
2	saying security application of the convention. But	2	A. Yeah.
3	generally, I will say okay.	_	
	• • •	3	Q. So I I was wondering whether, since 1995, you would
4	Q. Generally, you think that	3 4	Q. So I I was wondering whether, since 1995, you would also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in
4 5	Q. Generally, you think that A. Yeah, yeah.		-
	· ·	4	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in
5	A. Yeah, yeah.	4 5	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank.
5 6	A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33	4 5 6	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is
5 6 7	A. Yeah, yeah.Q 32 and 33A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah.
5 6 7 8	A. Yeah, yeah.Q 32 and 33A. Not to review every word; you know? (Reporter clarification.)	4 5 6 7 8	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you
5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know? (Reporter clarification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: 	4 5 6 7 8 9	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry.
5 6 7 8 9	A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know? (Reporter clarification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. Let me finish the question.	4 5 6 7 8 9	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt.
5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know? (Reporter clarification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. Let me finish the question. Generally, you think that 32 and 33 are a fair 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know? (Reporter clarification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. Let me finish the question. Generally, you think that 32 and 33 are a fair summary of what Mr. Reisner has said before? A. Yes. Q. All right. And I take it you don't endorse every word	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every domestic legal system, but I don't think that they are
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every domestic legal system, but I don't think that they are applicable as laws, for example, that you can enforce in
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every domestic legal system, but I don't think that they are applicable as laws, for example, that you can enforce in court, but you need to endorse local local local laws on this.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know? (Reporter clarification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. Let me finish the question. Generally, you think that 32 and 33 are a fair summary of what Mr. Reisner has said before? A. Yes. Q. All right. And I take it you don't endorse every word that he's said here, but you think he fairly captures the spirit of it; is that fair to say? A. Yes, you can say. Q. All right. Are there any particular things in paragraph 32 or 33 that you would omit? A. "Omit"? 32 okay, so in respect exist in local law 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every domestic legal system, but I don't think that they are applicable as laws, for example, that you can enforce in court, but you need to endorse local local laws on this. So I'm not sure that I mean, the question is
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every domestic legal system, but I don't think that they are applicable as laws, for example, that you can enforce in court, but you need to endorse local local local laws on this.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every domestic legal system, but I don't think that they are applicable as laws, for example, that you can enforce in court, but you need to endorse local local laws on this. So I'm not sure that I mean, the question is whether a peace treaty, an international agreement, is the source of law. I
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every domestic legal system, but I don't think that they are applicable as laws, for example, that you can enforce in court, but you need to endorse local local laws on this. So I'm not sure that I mean, the question is whether a peace treaty, an international agreement, is the source of law. I Q. So
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yeah, yeah. Q 32 and 33 A. Not to review every word; you know?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	also include the Interim Agreement as a source of law in the West Bank. A. It's an international agreement, yes, that is applicable, yeah. Q. So you A. But you know sorry. Q. No, please, go ahead; I didn't mean to interrupt. A. It's an international agreement which is applicable. Q. So is it included, or would you amend your report, maybe to add an additional bullet point? A. This is a the international agreement, like peace agreement, are not then depends, I think, on every domestic legal system, but I don't think that they are applicable as laws, for example, that you can enforce in court, but you need to endorse local local laws on this. So I'm not sure that I mean, the question is whether a peace treaty, an international agreement, is the source of law. I

	Page 41		Page 43
1	what is the organic source of authority for the	1	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,
2	Palestinian Authority to have a police department,	2	since the '90s.
3	wouldn't that be the interim agreement?	3	Q. Okay. And then and then there are sort of
4	A. Yeah, but then they okay, it's an organic source; but	4	a second source of law we might consider to be
5	then they need to establish the legal the legal	5	norm-creating provisions, customary international law?
6	structure. Right?	6	A. "Second"? Why customary are second? No.
7	Q. But	7	Q. Well, the first one I identified was treaties
8	A. And then this will be the law which is applicable.	8	A. Ah, okay, yeah, but it's not in here, or it's simply
9	Yeah, but in that sense, yes. So you could	9	yeah. Okay.
10	yeah, I would then in that sense, I would as	10	Q. Sure. Okay, fair enough. I'm not
11	a source of constitution yeah. Yeah.	11	A. Yeah.
12	Q. Certainly the interim agreement binds the parties who	12	Q. I'm not contending that one is
13	signed it?	13	A. Okay.
14	A. Yeah, yeah. Of course, of course. I maybe I was	14	Q superior to the other.
15	more referring to the legislation that is applicable in	15	A. Yeah, okay.
16	the military court.	16	Q. Customary international law results from a general and
17	Q. I see.	17	consistent practice of states followed by a sense of
18	A. Yeah.	18	legal obligation; correct?
19	Q. I see. All right.	19	A. Correct.
20	A. No, no, not only, no, it's not true, because I put	20	Q. It's been said that the within the relevant states,
21	other yeah, but yeah, I would	21	the will to follow such a norm has to be formed that the
22	Q. You would include it?	22	rule will become law if a relevant number of states who
23	A. Probably, yeah. Yeah.	23	share this will is reached; is that right?
24	Q. All right. So I want to talk with you and by the	24	A. Can you read this again, more fluently? Yeah, I mean
25	way, I didn't sort of do the courtesies at the beginning	25	Q. I think that the concept is it's not merely that
	Page 42		Page 44
1	of our conversation, but if you'd like to pause and take	1	a number of states follow a practice, but they have to
2	a break at any time, you just let me know; it's okay.	2	have the will that it become law, the practice.
3	A. Yeah, I know. Thank you.	3	A. No, they have to believe that yeah, that this is the
4	Q. Okay.	4	law, that they are doing it because it is the law. An
5	I'd like to ask you a little bit about sources of	5	opinion juris system, yeah.
6	international law.	6	Q. I'm sorry
7	A. Yeah, please.	7	A. Oh, it's the Latin word, "opinion juris," but it's
8	Q. There are conventions or treaties which are binding by	8	not
9	virtue of ratification; right?	9	Q. J-U-R-I-S?
10	A. Right.	10	A. Yeah. Yeah.
11	Q. And unless the treaty or convention is a norm-creating	11	Q. In order for something to be a norm-creating provision,
12	convention, or has norm-creating provisions, the	12	state practice should have been both extensive and
13	convention is only binding or the treaty is only	13	virtually uniform in the sense of the provision invoked;
14	binding on the parties that ratify it; is that fair to	14	would you agree with that?
15	say?	15	A. The question of "extensive" is always a question.
16	A. Unless it represents a customary norm that has emerged,	16 17	I mean, do you need a lot of country, or do you need the
17	or since what the crystallized within these		country that can exercise this, because, you know so,
18	customary laws.	18 19	yes, but it's true that anyway, identifying a custom
19 20	Q. So but in any case, Israel is indeed a signatory to the Fourth Geneva Convention; right?	20	is not an easy task; this, I agree. Q. The Fourth Hague Convention has provisions on the law of
21	A. And the Human Rights Convention, yeah.	21	war; right?
22	Q. And the Human Rights Convention? Which Human Rights	22	A. (Witness nods.)
23	Convention is it a signatory to?	23	Q. You have to speak.
24	A. The Convention Against Torture. Let's say the relevance	24	A. It it was a question?
25	for here is the Convention Against Torture and the	25	Q. Yes. But I'll say it again.
	<u> </u>		11 (Dages 41 to 44)

	Page 45		Page 47
1	A. Yeah.	1	A. These are the usually the ones that yeah.
2	Q. I'll ask it in a different way	2	Q. Those are the usual suspects?
3	A. Yeah, sorry, yeah.	3	A. The usuals, yeah.
4	Q to make sure does the Fourth Hague Convention	4	Q. I want to ask you about one other concept
5	A. Ah, that if it's a custom.	5	A. Mm-hmm.
6	Q. Well, first of all, the Fourth Hague Convention deals	6	Q in international law, general international law,
7	with the laws of war; right?	7	which is lex specialis.
8	A. Mm-hmm, yes.	8	A. Mm-hmm.
9	Q. And has that entered into customary international law,	9	Q. What is that?
10	in your opinion?	10	A. In public international law, you have different rules to
11	A. Yes.	11	solve problems of conflict of law. So one of them is
12	Q. What is your evidential basis for that view?	12	for example, that a later norm should prevail on an
13	A. It was stated by in the Hague regulation. I'm also	13	older one; this is one rule.
14	referring to the annexed Hague regulation. It was	14	Another rule is the rule of lex specialis, the
15	recognized as such, for example, by the Israeli High	15	the one that is better specified right, speciality,
16	Court of Justice; by the ICJ, International Court of	16	specified is the applicable norm.
17	Justice; by the ICRC customary study, so	17	So these norms come from the conflict of law norms.
18	Q. Now I want to ask you about a third source of	18	Q. So it's the specific trumps the general?
19	international law, which really is maybe a special case,	19	A. Yes, exactly.
20	or a third form of international law, which I think of	20	Q. And it can take the form of a derogation from general
21	as a special case of norm-creating provisions. And	21	law; right?
22	that's jus cogens, or preemptory norms. Could you	22	A. It can be different, yes.
23	explain what that is?	23	Q. So I'm thinking of, like, in
24	A. Yeah. So if we were speaking about hierarchy, this was	24	A. I mean yeah.
25	the first one to sit; right?	25	Q. Like, the example I'm thinking of is like Article 4 of
	Page 46		Page 48
1	Q. Mm-hmm.	1	the ICCPR. So that article provides for exceptions to
2	A. This has what we what we call the nonderogable right,	2	certain
3	and they have if you compare it to national law, they	3	A. A derogation clause.
4	have, like, a constitutional statute, okay, we can say,	4	Q rights.
5	compared to domestic legislation, which means that all	5	A. Yeah.
6	legislation have to comply with this jus cogens. And it	6	Q. Right. Certain it's a Article 4 of the ICCPR is
7	is a nonderogable rule.	7	a derogation clause; right?
8	Q. Is it fair to say that if a norm has achieved the status	8	A. Right.
9	of jus cogens, under no circumstances is it permitted to	9	Q. And it it allows for derogation of some of the
10	derogate from it?	10	provisions of the ICCPR
11	A. Yes.	11	A. Right.
12	Q. And some some forms of well, some actions that	12	Q. In times of public emergency
13	I think you and I would agree fall into the jus cogens	13	A. Right.
14	category would include piracy?	14	Q. Is that fair to say?
15	A. Yes.	15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Slavery?	16	Q. And that would be an example of lex specialis?
17	A. Yes.	17	A. Of no, I no, because of what? Of the general
18	Q. War crimes?	18	rule?
19	A. War crime where do you bring this citation	19	Q. Where where a state
20	Q. Perhaps that's too broad of a term	20	A. It's a derogation clause within the treaty.
21	A. Yeah, it may be. I would say torture achieved the jus	21	Q. Right. And so when when a State declares a public
22	cogens.	22	emergency
23	Q. Genocide?	23	A. Yeah.
24	A. Genocide, yes.	24	Q and says, "We're we're going to derogate from this
25	Q. Others that you can think of?	25	generally applicable provision because we're in

	Page 49		Page 51
1	a special circumstance," they've in essence created lex	1	depends if the treaty lets you to do it or not. But
2	specialis?	2	I mean, normally, you with great reservation, yeah.
3	A. No, we don't call it "lex specialis"; it's a derogation	3	Q. So so the ICJ said in the North Sea cases it's well
4	from the obligation and you know, and the article	4	understood that in practice, rules of international law
5	requires for the extent strictly required for the	5	can, by agreement, be derogated from in particular cases
6	time for the time of national emergency, I think is	6	or as between particular parties.
7	the wording, actually.	7	A. Yeah.
8	Q. And then another I'm sorry?	8	Q. You agree with that?
9	A. No, no, I'm just trying to remember if it's written	9	A. Yeah, yeah. Yes. But lex specialis is not yeah, you
10	"national threat" or "national security" I don't	10	could also connect lex specialis in the sense that
11	remember the wording exactly.	11	I will I will use "derogation," better than "lex
12	Q. "Public emergency," I think, is the wording.	12	specialis," okay, but it's term yeah.
13	A. I don't know. We need to check.	13	Q. Excellent.
14	Q. We can look it up.	14	A. Okay.
15	A. Yeah, it's not	15	Q. Okay. I don't really care what word we call it.
16	(Discussion off the record.)	16	A. Exactly. Yeah.
17	MR. YALOWITZ: Let's do a break now, take a break now.	17	Q. It's the idea that matters. Okay.
18	(A break was taken.)	18	So do you know, in general, about how many
19	(10:35 a.m.)	19	prosecutions there have been in the Israeli military
20	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	20	courts since 1967?
21	Q. So I want to ask you also I read that lex specialis	21	A. The number of cases prosecuted I cannot tell you the
22	could be an elaboration or application of general law to	22	exact figure. I read one statistic was speaking from
23	a particular situation; do you agree with that?	23	the '90s until until 2007, I think, was one hundred
24	A. "Elaboration of the law"? What do you mean,	24	let me (French spoken)
25	"elaboration of the law"?	25	Q. 160,000?
	Page 50		Page 52
1	Q. Sure. So so parties are entitled to establish	1	A. Yeah, 150,000 cases. But not from '67; from the '90s.
2	specific rights or obligations to govern their behavior	2	So I don't know the exact, but it's a huge amount
3	against the backdrop of a more general obligation;	3	of cases. I think it's one statistic that I read,
4	right?	4	I didn't count. I don't know.
5	A. Parties parties to what? To a treaty?	5	Q. Does that sound about right, directionally? Do you know
6	Q. For example.	6	what I mean by "directionally"? Like, it's not that
7	So maybe if I gave you an example	7	there've only been 50 cases; it's been thousands and
8	A. Yeah. Maybe.	8	thousands
9	Q it might be helpful.	9	A. Yes.
10	A. Maybe.	10	Q of cases?
11	Q. Okay. There is a convention on the law of the sea;	11	A. Yes.
12	right?	12	Q. And does that statistic did the statistic that you
13	A. Mm-hmm, mm-hmm.	13	read, did it include administrative detentions, or was
14	Q. You have to	14	it simply prosecutions?
15	A. Yes. Yes.	15	A. I can't tell; I'm sorry. I don't remember. Yeah.
16	Q. And and then parties can decide rather than apply	16	Q. In I have it right that in the military courts of
17	the exact provisions of the convention of the law of the	17	Israel, if a defendant chooses to have counsel, he or
18	sea, they're going to reach an agreement to specify how	18	she is entitled to have counsel; right?
19	that might apply to them in their particular situation?	19	A. The the defendant are entitled to have a a lawyer,
20	A. So you might call, sometime, reservations for a general	20	by law. Now the law restricts sometimes the meeting
21	treaty, for example; this may be the word,	21	with the lawyer. During the interrogation, it can be up
22	"reservation." For example, if they join a treaty, but	22	to 30 days without seeing a lawyer, which is longer than
23	some provision, it doesn't want doesn't fit to advice, you say, "I reserve from this provision."	23 24	in Israel. Then you have quite problems of access,
24	auvice, you say, I leselve Holli tills provision.	4	because during interrogation, they are detained in
25	And now, if you do another bilateral agreement, it	25	Israel, the arrested people; and then the lawyer

	Page 53		Page 55
1 .	Palestinian lawyers cannot access these places.	1	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation.
2	Q. By the time a person has been by the time a person	2	You can answer, if you can.
3	has been convicted in the military courts of Israel, he	3	A. I don't I don't really by whom?
4	or she shall, if he chooses or she chooses to have	4	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
5	a lawyer, can retain one; right? I mean, I understand	5	Q. Well, let me
6	there's some nuance about how soon they can get one; but	6	A. By the yeah.
7	at some point, if they want a lawyer to represent them	7	Q. Well, let me ask a different question.
8	during the course of a trial, they're entitled to that.	8	So would you consider Avigdor Feldman a human rights
9	Right?	9	lawyer?
10	A. I don't think it's a nuance where you are investigated	10	A. He's a criminal law lawyer, and he did human rights
11	and you don't know exactly your rights, and then you	11	cases, yeah.
12	give a confession that sometimes is a forced confession;	12	Q. And would you agree with me that his from
13	and then, when you meet with your lawyer, you already	13	a reputational perspective, he's highly regarded as
14	have your confession.	14	a lawyer?
15	And this is very important when you meet your	15	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.
16	lawyer. The entire point is to meet the lawyer during	16	If you know, you can answer.
17	your interrogation. When you do it after, yes, you have	17	A. It depends by whom. I don't understand who's who you
18	a lawyer that will administrate your trial in the	18	if judge of the court, or the general public, they
19	military court and do a plea bargain, usually.	19	probably don't know him, even. I don't know.
20	Q. And the the defendant who does not plead is entitled	20	Q. So well, do you regard
21	to appeal; right?	21	A. If the question is if there are good lawyers, there are
22	A. There is an appeal to there is the the military	22	good lawyers in Israel, yes.
23	court, they have two instance; first instance and	23	Q. Yeah, that's that's the question.
24	military court of appeal. Yeah.	24	A. Okay.
25	Q. Do you have a sense of how many appeals in the military	25	Q. And they and then, like Michael Sfard; is he
	Page 54		Page 56
1	courts there have been since 1967?	1	a well-regarded lawyer, in your opinion?
2	A. The military court of appeal was established in '99.	2	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation.
3	Now, how many appeals were accepted for the defendant?	3	But you can answer if you know.
4	This is what you are asking me? Or how many cases?	4	A. I I don't know what you mean by "well regarded."
5	Q. How many appeals were filed?	5	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
6	A. No, I don't know. I mean, this is statistic; I don't	6	Q. All right. I
7	remember.	7	A. It's I mean
8	Q. Is it would it be fair to say thousands?	8	Q. All right. It's fine.
9	A. I can assume, but I don't have the numbers. Yeah.	9	Okay. So you mentioned that you've taught on the
10	Q. You've read reported cases from the military court of	10	subject of the way the Supreme Court of Israel has dealt
11	appeals?	11	with matters relating to the occupation; is that right?
12	A. Yes.	12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Hundreds?	13	Q. And do I have it right that the jurisdiction of the
14	A. I haven't read hundreds; I won't say this. But	14	Supreme Court of Israel includes not only appellate
15	I read I read I don't think hundreds.	15	jurisdiction, but a right of access of original
16	Q. Are there hundreds?	16	jurisdiction for petitions relating to government
17	A. Hundreds? Again, I I don't know how many.	17	actions?
18	I didn't	18	A. Yes. The High Court of Justice is sitting as a as
19	Q. But one could check?	19	the High Court of Justice and as the Supreme Court. So
20	A. Yeah. I mean, I don't know.	20	one of the function of the High Court of Justice,
21	Q. All right. Fair enough.	21	individual and organization can submit petitions. Yeah.
22	Are there are there human rights lawyers who	22	Q. And has it has it been your experience that the High
23 24	practice in Israel? A. Yes.	23 24	Court of Justice has accepted petitions addressing the
25	A. Tes. Q. Are they highly regarded?	25	ways in which the Israeli military court system operates?
ر ہے	v. The diey inginy regulater.	ر ب	орегие»:

	Page 57		Page 59
1	A. Can you be more specific when this question? On the	1	A. Mm-hmm.
2	military courts yeah.	2	Q. It's too long a question.
3	Q. So to take an iconic example	3	A. No, no, I follow. Yeah.
4	A. Yeah.	4	Q. Okay. Can you give me a sense of how many cases the
5	Q the PICATI case: Do you know that acronym, Public	5	High Court of Justice has decided on the merits relating
6	Committee Against Torture in Israel?	6	to encounters between residents of the West Bank or Gaza
7	A. Yeah. Which one? From '99, or 2006?	7	and the military system of justice?
8	Q. From '99.	8	A. With the issue of administrative detention, or only
9	A. From '99, yeah.	9	prosecution of criminal case? Only prosecution, let's
10	Q. Right.	10	say; okay? I will answer only
11	A. The torture case; that's	11	Q. As you as you wish.
12	Q. That's an iconic case	12	A. Yeah. I will answer only related to issue related to
13	A. Yeah.	13	prosecution, except of administrative detention.
14	Q right?	14	Now, there were also some cases on condition of
15	You have to	15	detention; would you include them also?
16	A. Yes.	16	Q. Yes. Yes.
17	Q wait for me to finish, and then speak. You're doing	17	A. I will say dozen maybe ten, something like this.
18	pretty well, but	18	Q. And do you have a sense as to how many petitions there
19	That's an iconic case; right?	19	have been presenting questions to the High Court of
20	A. "Iconic"; it means "landmark," or ?	20	Justice relating to the real relating to the
21	Q. Yeah, very famous.	21	administration of justice in the military court system?
22	A. "Famous"; it is a famous case, yes.	22	A. I don't know.
23	Q. And that that relates to GSS investigations; right?	23	Q. Fair to say hundreds?
24	A. Yes.	24	A. But then and then the you think that I mean,
25	Q. And GSS investigations are of security prisoners; right?	25	your point is they were the State agreed, and they
	Page 58		Page 60
1	A. Yes.	1	didn't have to deliver a judgment? Like, there was
2	Q. And then if they're charged with crimes, those crimes	2	Q. No, no
3	are prosecuted in the military courts; right?	3	A an agreement between the sides? Or what do you mean?
4	A. Usually; not always. They can be also in civilian in	4	Q. No, no. So so my question was intended
5	Israel. It depends, because but in some cases, it	5	A. Because this happens also. You know.
6	will be in military court. Most of them.	6	Q. Sure.
7	Q. Most of them?	7	My question it's a fair request for
8	A. Most of them.	8	clarification.
9	Q. Fair enough.	9	A. Mm-hmm.
10	And are there other cases that the High Court of	10	Q. My question was more broadly: A petition to the High
11			
12	Justice has addressed dealing with aspects relating to	11	Court of Justice, I suppose, could end with with an
1 1	prosecutions in the military courts?	12	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor
13	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the	12 13	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is
14	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003.	12 13 14	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement?
14 15	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is	12 13 14 15	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah.
14 15 16	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested	12 13 14 15 16	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to
14 15 16 17	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested before seeing a judge. You know, it was eight days, and	12 13 14 15 16 17	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to the High Court of Justice relating to the military court
14 15 16 17 18	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested before seeing a judge. You know, it was eight days, and now it is it is before the court.	12 13 14 15 16 17	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to the High Court of Justice relating to the military court system do you believe have been commenced?
14 15 16 17 18 19	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested before seeing a judge. You know, it was eight days, and now it is it is before the court. There are different cases, yeah.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to the High Court of Justice relating to the military court system do you believe have been commenced? A. "Commesed"? What does it mean, "commesed"? Ah,
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested before seeing a judge. You know, it was eight days, and now it is it is before the court. There are different cases, yeah. Q. Can you give us an estimate as to how many cases the	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to the High Court of Justice relating to the military court system do you believe have been commenced? A. "Commesed"? What does it mean, "commesed"? Ah, "commenced."
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested before seeing a judge. You know, it was eight days, and now it is it is before the court. There are different cases, yeah. Q. Can you give us an estimate as to how many cases the High Court of Justice has decided on the merits in which	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to the High Court of Justice relating to the military court system do you believe have been commenced? A. "Commesed"? What does it mean, "commesed"? Ah, "commenced." Q. "Filed."
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested before seeing a judge. You know, it was eight days, and now it is it is before the court. There are different cases, yeah. Q. Can you give us an estimate as to how many cases the High Court of Justice has decided on the merits in which some aspect of the system from arrest through to	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to the High Court of Justice relating to the military court system do you believe have been commenced? A. "Commesed"? What does it mean, "commesed"? Ah, "commenced." Q. "Filed." A. "Filed"?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested before seeing a judge. You know, it was eight days, and now it is it is before the court. There are different cases, yeah. Q. Can you give us an estimate as to how many cases the High Court of Justice has decided on the merits in which some aspect of the system from arrest through to detention, prosecution, appeal, imprisonment that the	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to the High Court of Justice relating to the military court system do you believe have been commenced? A. "Commesed"? What does it mean, "commesed"? Ah, "commenced." Q. "Filed." A. "Filed"? Q. Yes.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	prosecutions in the military courts? A. I don't know if you will for example, there was the reviewing an order concerning detention in 2003. There was recently, again, a reviewing I mean, it is still pending, about the how long you can be arrested before seeing a judge. You know, it was eight days, and now it is it is before the court. There are different cases, yeah. Q. Can you give us an estimate as to how many cases the High Court of Justice has decided on the merits in which some aspect of the system from arrest through to	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	order in favor of the petitioner, or an order in favor of the State, or if you will, a plea bargain, which is what your right? Some form of an agreement? A. Yeah. Q. Of any of those three outcomes, how many petitions to the High Court of Justice relating to the military court system do you believe have been commenced? A. "Commesed"? What does it mean, "commesed"? Ah, "commenced." Q. "Filed." A. "Filed"?

	Page 61		Page 63
1	Q. Would you say hundreds?	1	Court of Justice, that has addressed whether the
2	A. No.	2	military courts are properly constituted within the
3	Q. Less?	3	meaning of Article 66 of the Fourth Geneva Convention?
4	A. It's difficult for me to assess this. How I mean,	4	A. This I know that there's never been a petition on
5	you know, it's something	5	this.
6	Q. All right.	6	Q. There's there's never been even a petition?
7	Has the High Court of Justice applied the Fourth	7	A. No, there's never been a petition on this question.
8	Geneva Convention to the military courts in Israel?	8	Q. No human rights group has ever raised this as an
9	A. Yes.	9	argument within Israel?
10	Q. How many times?	10	A. Specifically on the military courts, there were much
11	A. In one particular case, there was the Mareva case; that	11	less cases that any other issue related to the for
12	was in 2003. And then, when he was checking also the	12	example, conduct of hostilities, or settlements, or
13	condition of detention, he referred to the Geneva	13	whatever. Most of the cases were dealing with due
14	Convention. How many times again, since we are in	14	process issue, but we see that even today, we still have
15	a question of numbers; I'm not I'm not I'm not	15	a petition a very recent one was demanding the
16	sure of numbers.	16	translation of the indictment and the cases.
17	Q. Has the High Court of Justice applied the Fourth Hague	17	These courts, since '67, are doing it, and we have
18	Convention to the	18	this petition only in 2013, or '12. So you see, it's
19	A. The Hague regulation, yes.	19	a question of maturing, to bring cases to the petition,
20	Q. And can you think of some cases, off the top of your	20	to to have this and the issue of military courts
21	head, in which that has happened?	21	were less this issue of structure were not brought to
22	A. Relating to the military courts?	22	the High Court of Justice.
23	Q. Yes.	23	(Discussion off the record.)
24 25	A. But military court is less relevant to Hague regulation; it's more the Geneva Convention.	24 25	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
<u> </u>	it's more the Geneva Convention.	<u>4</u> 5	Q. Okay. Thank you.
	Page 62		Page 64
1	Q. So so let me ask, then, a broader question.	1	A. You're welcome.
2	A. Broader; yeah.	2	Q. Do you have you ever compared and contrast the
3	Q. Has the High Court of Justice applied the Hague	3	military courts sitting in the West Bank and Gaza,
4	regulations to conduct of the Israeli military in the	4	before disengagement, on the one hand, with the military
5	West Bank and Gaza?	5	courts in Israel that try soldiers for violation of
6	A. Yes.	6	military law?
7	Q. How many times?	7	A. Never. And I I'm not at all an expert on the martial
8	A. I don't know how many times	8	court, if you mean the martial court. They are working
9	Q. So so what are	9	under Israeli law. And you know, it's a different
10	A but in all the in all the petitions dealing with	10	different structure. I'm not at all an expert on this
11 12	the with the army with the Occupied Territories,	11 12	issue. I've been focusing on the law of military occupation in the military court.
13	it first says that it is a belligerent occupation; applicable law is the Hague regulation and the Fourth	13	Q. Do you know whether the appointment system in the in
14	Geneva Convention. I mean, usually, this is the opening	14	the two courts are different, or the same?
15	of the there were a lot of cases.	15	A. I know exactly what the appointment system in the
16	Q. That's what I'm sort of getting at. Maybe not there's	16	military courts is, which is deriving from the military
17	an exact number, but would you agree with me that it's	17	order enacted by the military commander. So I can only
18	well established in Israel that when evaluating matters	18	assume that it's not the same, because the military
19	relating to the military conduct in the West Bank and	19	the martial court I don't know the (French spoken)
20	Gaza, the courts begin with the Geneva Convention and	20	the provision of how military court and martial court
21	The Hague regulations.	21	are established, but it is a law enacted by the State,
22	A. It applies yes.	22	and not a military order.
23	Q. Okay.	23	Q. So in order to know whether the appointment system is
24	To your knowledge, has there been any case decided,	24	the same
25	either by the military courts themselves or by the High	25	A. We need to read the this law specific to the court
			16 (Pages 61 to 64)

	Page 65		Page 67
1	martial, yeah.	1	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
2	Q. Have you done that?	2	Q. Sure. I
3	A. No.	3	A. Is it intended to this was your question?
4	Q. Would you agree with me that jus cogens applies to the	4	Q. Sure. I believe I I believe I read that the PLO
5	PLO and the PA?	5	submitted to the designated authority some type of an
6	MR. SATIN: Objection. Compound question.	6	accession to the 1977 Additional Protocol
7	A. Generally, international law apply to state. This is	7	A. When they did this? Recently?
8	a law that is applicable to state. I say "generally,"	8	Q. No, I believe they did it
9	because more and more the international law evolved	9	A. No? Something yeah.
10	to include also nonstate actors, and for sure in IHL,	10	Q. I believe they did it a long time ago. Does that
11	the rule of for example, in noninternational	11	A. Somewhat
12	conflict, applied both to state and nonstate actors.	12	Q. Is that familiar to you?
13	But then, it depends: Human rights obligation, it	13	A. If they wanted to accede, but I can't I can't say
14	is not very clear if they apply to nonstate actors.	14	if they accede or not. I don't know.
15	There is some authors that said yes, some authors said	15	Q. In any case
16	no. So when we speak about jus cogens, we'd better to	16	A. Yeah.
17	think about a specific a specific	17	Q we agree that that Protocol 1 Additional
18	Q. A specific a specific norm?	18	Protocol 1 applies to the PLO and the PA; right?
19	A. Yeah, what are we talking about, yeah. Because if it's	19	MR. SATIN: Objection, compound question.
20	something related to IHL relation during an armed	20	A. First of all, Israel you know, Israel is not a party
21	conflict, which a nonstate actor is a part, of course,	21	to this protocol, exactly because of this provision.
22	it is bound by it.	22	And now, normally, the protocol would apply only
23	Q. It is ?	23	reciprocally; it means that in a conflict, the protocol
24	A. It is bound by the law, yeah.	24	will apply only if both parties ratify the protocol.
25	Q. Are you familiar with the 1977 Additional Protocol 1 to	25	But then we need to look on the what provision
	Q. Ale you familiar with the 17/1 Additional Flotocol 1 to	23	But then we need to look on the what provision
	Page 66		Page 68
1	the Geneva Convention?	1	are we talking about? Because if there are customary
2	A. Of course.	2	laws, so anyone, anyway, they are bound.
3	Q. And what is it?	3	Now, you are asking me if the conflict with the PLO
4	A. What it says? The protocol?	4	is an international armed conflict; this is actually
5	Q. Yeah.	5	your question. Right?
6	A. You want me to cite you the entire article?	6	Q. Well, you could answer that question. It wasn't my
7	Q. I do not. I trust that you could; I just	7	question, but I'm interested in your opinion on that.
8	A. No, in what relation?	8	A. So my opinion, I think that Justice Barak well
9	Q. So it by its terms, it governs wars of national	9	articulated this in the targeted killing case in 2006,
10	self-determination; is that right?	10	and this is exactly what he said. He said that he
11	A. The first protocol is a protocol that apply in	11	was citing Professor Cassese there I think it was
12	international armed conflict. Now, what you are	12	paragraph 18, but I'm not sure about the number of
13	referring to is Article 14, and it's questioning when	13	paragraphs; I think so. No, it was a very important
14	a conflict will be classified an international conflict.	14	paragraph and he was saying that when under occupation,
15	So, of course, it's state against state; it is an	15	the if you want to fight the occupation, it is an
16	international conflict.	16	international armed conflict.
17	And there is one provision in the protocol saying	17	So this is the legal analysis of the Israeli High
18	war or national liberation, which could be war of	18	Court of Justice. But they I'm not sure they
19	against colonization, apartheid, occupation, would be	19	won't apply Protocol 1 as such, only the customary one.
20	seen as an international conflict.	20	Q. So it's a it's a preemptory norm that civilian
21	Q. And do you understand that the PLO indicated its intent	21	populations, as such, as well as individual civilians,
22	to be bound by that protocol?	22	may not be the object of attack; right?
23	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation.	23	A. This is for sure. And this is absolutely customary
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
24 25	If you know A. Can you just repeat?	24 25	norm. And this is also a criminal norm, and yeah. I mean, the rule of distinction is the basic principle

	Page 69		Page 71
1 .	in IHL.	1	A. Of course.
2	Q. It is it is peremptory norm that acts or threats of	2	Q. And you agree with me that anyone who is not a combatant
3	violence, the primary purpose of which is to spread	3	is a civilian; right?
4	terror among the civilian population, are prohibited;	4	A. Yes.
5	right?	5	Q. You agree me that reprisals or retaliation against
6	A. Right.	6	civilians is absolutely prohibited; correct?
7	Q. And people who attack civilians intentionally, while	7	A. Absolutely.
8	aware of their civilian status, are committing war	8	Q. There is no legal excuse or justification for that,
9	crimes; right?	9	whatsoever; right?
10	A. Yes.	10	A. Absolutely.
11	Q. And the obligations not to do that are absolute; right?	11	Q. You agree with me that under international humanitarian
12	A. Right. I mean, there is targeting as such; then you	12	law, failure by one party to a conflict to respect the
13	have the question of proportionality. I mean, you are	13	laws of war does not relieve the other party of its
14	probably aware of this proportion that says that	14	obligation to respect those laws; right?
15	sometimes you have may have civilians as casualties, but	15	A. Absolutely.
16	they must not be targeted as such, of course.	16	Q. That obligation is not premised on reciprocity; right?
17	Q. So in your opinion, was the targeting of civilians	17	A. Yes.
18	during the Al-Aqsa Intifada, were those war crimes?	18	Q. You agree with me that well, are you familiar with an
19	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.	19	organization called Human Rights Watch?
20	A. The killing of civilian is a crime. This is murder, for	20	A. Yes.
21	sure. I mean, if someone kills someone, this is a	21	Q. And do you is it reasonable for people in your field
22	murder. Then whether it is a war crime, "yes" or "no,"	22	to rely on reports by Human Rights Watch?
23	then it depends whether it's a conflict; it depends on	23	A. Not rely the legal analyze, no, because the legal
24	different issues. Right? But of course, it's a crime.	24	analyze, I don't know the legal analyze, I rely on
25	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	25	academic journals and on professor academic
	Page 70		Page 72
1	Q. And you're aware or are you aware of arguments that	1	judges, et cetera. Of course, Human Rights Watch, you
2	were put toward to justify or excuse suicide bombings	2	know, they are sometimes written by my students; you
3	and other attacks on Israeli civilians?	3	know?
4	A. I'm not aware of jurists saying that it's legal;	4	But some of the it could be interesting to as
5	absolutely not. I've never read something like this.	5	a source of facts; sometimes this can be not as
6	Q. Have you did you ever read statements by Palestinian	6	a source, but as a report, and then you can look for the
7	politicians trying to justify attacking Israeli	7	facts and
8	civilians?	8	Q. So I'm sure, if they're written by your students, they
9	MR. SATIN: Objection. Assumes facts not in evidence. Lack	9	must be excellent work.
10	of foundation.	10	A. Yeah.
11	A. If I've ever I don't I don't know. I don't	11	Not so I mean what I mean by my answer is it
12	remember. I maybe I've heard once I don't know.	12	depends; what do you mean "to rely on it"? You know?
13	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	13	Q. Fair enough.
14	Q. So for example, did you ever hear anyone say that the	14	A. Yeah.
15	that the illegal status of settlements in the West Bank	15	Q. What I was thinking of is not the legal analysis
16	is a justification for attacking civilians?	16	A. Mm-hmm.
17	A. This is not a legal stand. It can't be a legal stand.	17	Q but the facts and data reported.
18	I don't know if people said this; I don't know. Q. If anyone said that, they would be wrong; right?	18 19	A. Okay. So again, this is always a problem with facts;
19 20	That's not a good question.		right? Who reports on the fact, and how do you know
21	A. Okay.	20	they are reliable? So for me, as if it's in the
22	•	21 22	context of the research or whatever, of course you need to have you gather information. So this can be one
		44	to have you gamed information. So this call be one
	Q. Let me ask you a different question. You agree with me that the status that the legal		· -
23	You agree with me that the status that the legal	23	source of information. But then you will look for what
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· -

	Page 73		Page 75
1	course it remains it remains what it is; you know?	1	A. Again, the judges go to election, when there are judges
2	Q. So so are you familiar with the Human Rights Watch	2	or after the judges are
3	report about the suicide bombings during the Al-Aqsa	3	Q. In order to become a judge
4	Intifada?	4	A. Yeah.
5	A. I must say that no, I'm not reading all their reports.	5	Q in many states
6	I'm no. You know, there are so many reports on	6	A. Yeah.
7	Israel and Palestine, and so many NGOs, this one	7	Q in the United States, you have to run for election,
8	Human Rights Watch, in general, I don't read so much;	8	like as if you were running for mayor.
9	I prefer to read local like local NGOs, mostly	9	A. To be elected as a judge, you mean?
10	I read. But you know, sometimes I can read Human Rights	10	Q. Yeah?
11	Watch, and Amnesty, but I don't read all their reports.	11	A. Yeah.
12	Q. Do you have a view on whether the PA and the PLO incited	12	MR. SATIN: Objection as to the statements of counsel.
13	violence during the Al-Aqsa Intifada?	13	MR. YALOWITZ: Trust me; I'm right on this one.
14	A. I have absolutely no no information of that. I never	14	A. Every no, every system need to have guaranteed to
15	worked on this question. I don't know.	15	have independent and impartial judges. So every state
16	Q. All right. So I want to ask you some questions about	16	has its own mechanism, and you need to verify the
17	structure and process in judicial systems generally.	17	mechanism. I don't know about this
18	A. Yeah.	18	(Reporter clarification.)
19	Sorry, would you mind if I go to the toilet?	19	MR. YALOWITZ: "Mechanism"
20	Q. Of course.	20	A. Obligation to make sure that judges are independent and
21	(11:14 a.m.)	21	impartial, and every state can have its own mechanism to
22	(A break was taken.)	22	ensure that.
23	(11:24 a.m.)	23	So specifically how is it in the US, I don't know;
24	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	24	but I'm sure in the US, they have check and balance to
25	Q. Would you agree with me that the form that a court takes	25	make sure that they are independent and impartial.
	Page 74		Page 76
1	is not subject to any customary norm?	1	I won't believe otherwise.
2	MR. SATIN: Objection, vague.	2	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
3	A. Yes, could you rephrase this?	3	Q. Having having a judge appointed by a military
4	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	4	commander, in and of itself, is not a violation of any
5	Q. Sure. So for example, there's no customary norm that	5	customary norm; right?
6	requires an adversarial system instead of an	6	A. Can you just repeat? I didn't hear very well the
7	inquisitorial system; right?	7	beginning.
8	A. Ah, specifically on this, so of course there are	8	Q. Sure.
9	customary norms regarding due process issues; yes, of	9	A. Yeah.
10			O Having a judge vyhele omnejmted hvy a militamy acmunenden
	Now, the important issue that you will have a due	10	Q. Having a judge who's appointed by a military commander
11	Now, the important issue that you will have a due	11	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm,
11 12	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial	11 12	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right?
11 12 13	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful	11 12 13	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be
11 12 13 14	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and	11 12 13 14	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004
11 12 13 14 15	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the	11 12 13 14 15	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that
11 12 13 14 15	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the adversarial system. So this is not a problem.	11 12 13 14 15	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that was issued by the military commander, was that judges
11 12 13 14 15 16	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the adversarial system. So this is not a problem. Q. Then having a jury or not having a jury is not the	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that was issued by the military commander, was that judges are appointed by the recommendation of the prosecutor
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the adversarial system. So this is not a problem. Q. Then having a jury or not having a jury is not the subject of a customary norm; right?	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that was issued by the military commander, was that judges are appointed by the recommendation of the prosecutor military prosecutor general and are appointed by the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the adversarial system. So this is not a problem. Q. Then having a jury or not having a jury is not the subject of a customary norm; right? A. No. There is no obligation to have a jury or not.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that was issued by the military commander, was that judges are appointed by the recommendation of the prosecutor military prosecutor general and are appointed by the military commander. So this raised serious question
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the adversarial system. So this is not a problem. Q. Then having a jury or not having a jury is not the subject of a customary norm; right? A. No. There is no obligation to have a jury or not. Q. Having judges elected does not violate customary norms;	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that was issued by the military commander, was that judges are appointed by the recommendation of the prosecutor military prosecutor general and are appointed by the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the adversarial system. So this is not a problem. Q. Then having a jury or not having a jury is not the subject of a customary norm; right? A. No. There is no obligation to have a jury or not. Q. Having judges elected does not violate customary norms; right?	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that was issued by the military commander, was that judges are appointed by the recommendation of the prosecutor military prosecutor general and are appointed by the military commander. So this raised serious question about the issue of impartiality and independency, structural.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the adversarial system. So this is not a problem. Q. Then having a jury or not having a jury is not the subject of a customary norm; right? A. No. There is no obligation to have a jury or not. Q. Having judges elected does not violate customary norms;	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that was issued by the military commander, was that judges are appointed by the recommendation of the prosecutor military prosecutor general and are appointed by the military commander. So this raised serious question about the issue of impartiality and independency,
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Now, the important issue that you will have a due process, of course inquisitory process and adversarial are both legitimate; I mean, you have wonderful countries, like France, with the inquisitory system, and you have wonderful state like the UK with the adversarial system. So this is not a problem. Q. Then having a jury or not having a jury is not the subject of a customary norm; right? A. No. There is no obligation to have a jury or not. Q. Having judges elected does not violate customary norms; right? A. Judges need to be independent and impartial.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	does not, in and of itself, violate any customary norm, right? A. Again, the customary norm is the judge need to be independent and impartial. Now, what we had until 2004 in the Occupied Territory, under the military order that was issued by the military commander, was that judges are appointed by the recommendation of the prosecutor military prosecutor general and are appointed by the military commander. So this raised serious question about the issue of impartiality and independency, structural. Q. So so is it your view that having a judge appointed

Page 79 Page 77 1 recommendation of the military prosecutor, I think that 1 alia, the separation of powers, of course. 2 2 this is a violation of the requirement of independency, Q. And so is it -- the situation that I just described in 3 yes. 3 my hypothetical, is that a violation of international 4 Q. And is -- is it -- is it your view that it's impossible 4 5 to be independent because of the way in which a judge is 5 A. It is a violation of the requirement of independency, 6 appointed? б yes. 7 7 A. Structurally, it's -- let me answer from the beginning. Q. Okay. Thank you. 8 8 In order to ensure the judges are independent, we Now I want to ask you about a statement you make on 9 establish structural requirement to make sure, like, 9 page 13 of your report. 10 that they have tenure, like the way they're elected is 10 A. Yes, I have it. 11 independent, that they can function as they want. This 11 Q. Let's look together. 12 is the issue of structure. Then you have the issue of 12 You wrote under subheading 2 -- first you quoted 13 any individual person, whether he is -- you know, 13 from Article 14 of the ICCPR; do you see that? 14 14 independent, and et cetera. A. The second sentence? I'm looking at the structural issue. There are 15 15 O. Yes. 16 basic requirements to be respected in order to maintain 16 A. Yes. Mm-hmm. 17 that structurally, the judges are independent. So if 17 Q. And then following that, you wrote this means 18 they need the promotion from the one who is depending on 18 establishing separate courts for different groups of 19 their election, it's problematic. If there are -- if 19 people based on a variety of factors, including national 20 20 there is no separation between the prosecution, the origin, is a contravention of Article 14. 21 execution and the -- the judge themselves, this is 21 A. Yes. 22 22 problematic. Q. Am I fairly summarizing that? 23 If judges are not enough competent to know the law, 23 A. Yes, yes, absolutely. 24 criminal law, it's problematic. Everything brings that 24 Q. I didn't quote it --25 25 there's a problem with independency of the judges. A. No, no, it's fine. Page 78 Page 80 1 1 Q. -- exactly. And -- yes. 2 2 Q. So if you have a structure in which the chief executive And would you -- would you agree with me that --3 is in charge of the prosecutor, and also in charge of 3 well, let me ask you this: How would you reconcile that 4 4 nominating a judge for elevation, say, to a court of statement with Article 66, which requires civilians from 5 5 appeals, would that be a problematic situation, in your an occupied territory to be tried in a military court? 6 6 MR. SATIN: Objection. Misstates the evidence. 7 7 A. What is "elevation"? A. I don't see any contradiction. In occupied territories, 8 8 Q. Like -- promotion. Promotion from, say, a lower court the territorial jurisdiction is under the responsibility 9 9 to a higher court. of the military commander, which can establish military 10 10 A. So the question was if the judge will promote another court, as we discussed at the beginning. 11 judge -- no, what was --11 Now, what happened during the years -- so in '67, 12 12 Q. No. when they were established, there is absolutely no 13 13 A. I'm sorry. problem, and people were under the jurisdiction of this court, Palestinian residents. 14 Q. So -- suppose you -- I'll start with giving you a 14 15 hypothetical situation. 15 Now, with the time when Israeli presence start to be 16 16 A. Yeah. Mm-hmm. more and more important in the Occupied Territory, there 17 Q. Suppose you have a single individual who is in charge of 17 is a situation created where you have people living in 18 the prosecutor, all prosecutors, and the same individual 18 the same territorial jurisdiction, while the Palestinian 19 is responsible for nominating --19 will be under the jurisdiction of this court, and 20 20 A. The judges? Israeli of another court. Q. -- all judges. Would that be problematic, in your view? 21 21 This is the problem. So you can have a situation --22 22 and you have situation -- in which two people commit the 23 23 Q. In your view, would that violate international norms? exact same crime on the exact same place, and they will

24

25

24

25

A. In my view, it violate the requirement of independency,

and -- yes, that should be safeguarded by, inter

be under the jurisdiction of two different courts, two

different criminal courts, two different rules of

	Page 81		Page 83
1	procedure. And this is absolutely unacceptable from the	1	Q. Do you want me to say it again?
2	point of view of international law and equality.	2	A. Yeah, can please, yeah.
3	Q. So in your opinion, would it cure the problem if	3	Q. Sure; okay, as a legal matter
4	Israelis who commit security crimes were to be tried,	4	A. Yes.
5	de facto, in the military court sitting in the Occupied	5	
6	Territories?		Q Israeli citizens who commit crimes in the West Bank
7	A. What would cure the problem and I want to go back now	6 7	that threaten the security of the State of Israel are
8	to the fact that IHL and the law of military occupation		subject to prosecution in the Israeli military courts;
	• •	8	right? A. Yes.
9	was not designed to govern a civilian population during	9	
10	45 years. We must remember this. So any adaptation	10	Q. And your criticism is that in fact, when Israelis commit
11	that we will do, modulation	11	such crimes, they are prosecuted in the civilian courts
12	Q. Modulate?	12	in Israel; right? That is a criticism you render in
13	A. Modulating the law, in order to fit, will be necessarily	13	section 2 of your report?
14	a kind of twisting and distortion of the law.	14	A. My criticism is that showing this practice, that as a
15	So I would like civilians not to be tried in	15	matter of policy, Israeli citizens Jewish Israeli
16	military occupation by an alien army. I would like	16	citizens are prosecuted in Israel civilian courts, its
17	these civilians, including children, to have due process	17	only reinforce the assumption that the military courts
18	right by regular court.	18	are political courts that are there, one, to exercise
19	Now, the fact that we have this occupation for	19	a kind of control, domination of this population, and to
20	45 years, it means that these courts are still	20	impose on them a due process rule that are less good.
21	functioning, but this is wrong. Now, if you would put	21	Because why would Israeli be prosecuted in Israel if
22	Israeli civilians under the jurisdiction of this court,	22	this system was so great?
23	it won't cure their situation; it will only cure the	23	It's not only a question whether it's civil or
24	situation of the kind of apartheid that had been	24	military, it's the question of the intent of the rules
25	established.	25	that you have applied.
	Page 82		Page 84
1	So for this, it would cure this difference; but to	1	Q. So I want to be very, very specific: Your criticism in
2	cure the situation is that military court should not try	2	section 2 of your report that we're looking at, which
3	civilian, and as you know, they try them they expand	3	begins on 13, is not of the military courts themselves;
4	the jurisdiction to try them for car traffic, drugs	4	it's of the policy decision not to try Israelis in those
5	issues, stealing cars. I mean, it's not only you	5	courts. Is that fair to say?
6	know, notorious terrorists that are being prosecuted.	6	A. In order to assess the legality of the courts, one has
7	Q. Well, our case is about notorious terrorists being	7	to look at the broader picture. And this is exactly
8	prosecuted; right?	8	what this article from 2011 is dealing with, meaning
9	A. Everyone is entitled to due process, as the US Supreme	9	that, yes, the policy is that now there is a segregated
10	Court in Hamdan said.	10	policy; this is how you should name it.
11	Q. Agreed. I I have no debate with you about about	11	Now, in this state of affairs, what we have we
12	defendants being entitled to due process, and I want to	12	have two different kind of legal system, two different
13	ask you some questions about due process in our cases.	13	populations, and therefore the assumption is that these
14	My question, really, was more directed to the	14	courts are not properly constituted, in the sense they
15	specific thing that you're talking about in item 2 of	15	are a political court. I mean, I said that.
16	your report, which is an unequal unequal prosecution,	16	Q. Do you think that well, how would you cure the
17	which I think we agree; let me let me just ask you	17	problem you're identifying?
18	a more pointed question.	18	A. I will end occupation.
19	You agree that as a de jure matter, Israelis are	19	Q. Other than ending the occupation.
20	subject to prosecution in the military courts for crimes	20	A. No, it's not "other," but this is the source of the
21	committed in the West Bank; right?	21	problem, that we are applying okay, so I have two
22	A. "Jury matter"?	22	proposition. One is to end the occupation and to stop
23	Q. "De jure"; "de jure."	23	applying IHL, a law that was designed to apply for
	A Ab Okay Samu I didn't understand this word	2.4	a short tarm and not to govern 15 years a civilian

24

25

24

25

De jure --

A. Ah. Okay. Sorry, I didn't understand this word.

a short term, and not to govern 45 years a civilian

population. Okay? They don't have any basics right,

Page 85 Page 87 1 but subordinate to an alien army, one -- this is -- this 1 is generally violating the right of civilian to be 2 2 is the one. How can you govern a population with such prosecuted by independent court. In general, it's 3 3 a general law? better that civilian are prosecuted in civilian court. Q. So let me -- let me ask it specifically. Let's 4 4 Therefore, military court should not expand their 5 assume --5 jurisdiction. When I'm talking about "military court," 6 A. Yeah. б I'm talking about the legislation applicable and their 7 7 Q. -- that it is not within our power to establish peace own case law. Because, as you read in my 2007 article, 8 between Israel and the PLO today. 8 military court keep expanding their jurisdiction over 9 9 A. Mm-hmm. different crimes, that normally should not be under this 10 Q. But suppose you were -- you were asked by the powers 10 jurisdiction; extraterritorial application of the law. 11 that be in the State of Israel: "We would like to have 11 So this is the kind of expanding on one hand and reducing on the other hand, which means to exclude the 12 a court system that protects the security of the 12 13 citizens of Israel" --13 settlers. 14 14 A. Okav. So to cure, it's very simplicit to say, "Let's put 15 Q. -- "and recognizes the fact that we have -- we cannot 15 them in Tel Aviv and prosecute them there." It's not --16 withdraw from the West Bank. What kind of court system 16 it's -- much more work will be needed to cure the 17 would you recommend?" 17 18 A. So we have to -- in order to cure the situation, we have 18 But if I go back to -- just to summarize what I've said, so not to create two legal system, and one that 19 to address several issues. First of all is stopping 19 20 the -- a process of colonialization is directly linked 20 the jurisdiction of the military court will be to 21 to this, because this brought to be what we call the 21 restrict it to what has been provided. 22 22 apartheid system in the West Bank, because you bring So there are two -- you know ... 23 Israelis with their own law, and you have the 23 Q. I'm not sure I understood the part about Tel Aviv. 24 Palestinians under the IHL law and military law, 24 A. No, because you said to cure the -- no, no, no, sorry; 25 25 et cetera. So you have two people living in the same right. I did -- you said that to cure the situation, Page 86 Page 88 1 place in the same population. 1 everyone should be prosecuted in the military court, 2 2 So what we will need to have is that the entire yes. Sorry. 3 territorial jurisdiction, the entire West Bank, will be 3 Q. That was the premise of my --4 under the law of military occupation, unified. And what 4 A. Yeah, yeah, sorry. Yeah. 5 is interesting is that the settlements are bound by 5 Q. Not Tel Aviv. 6 military orders, because they are established through б A. Not Tel Aviv, yes. No, this is a mistake, sorry. Yeah. 7 military orders; right? But some of them were --7 Q. Okay. So now I want you -- well, you've just described a -- what we might call a hypothetical legal system for 8 8 I mean -- not established, but many of the -- many of 9 9 the organization, through military orders. the West Bank. 10 But of course, their military orders are different 10 A. What -- which one? 11 from the military orders from the Palestinians. So you 11 Q. The one where all Israelis and Palestinians are subject 12 have an entire legislation which is different. And not 12 to the military courts, number 1, instead of having two 13 only the legislation is different, but they were 13 systems, we have only one system; and number 2, the 14 excluded from the jurisdiction of -- that had the 14 military court jurisdiction is limited to its core 15 territorial jurisdiction; right? We are talking 15 competency of things such as security crimes. territorial jurisdiction. 16 16 Have I fairly summarized --17 So in order to cure this, you need to make first of 17 A. It's not -- I'm not speaking about -- nothing 18 all a unified legal system in the West Bank, which is 18 hypothetical; I'm speaking about how the law should be, and how Israel, through the colonialization, created 19 the law of the occupation, local law, Jordanian law, 19 20 what we mentioned before. But creating these two zones 20 this dual legal system. But it's not a question of 21 of law, this is what brought to this segregated legal 21 hypothetical; it's a question that in a territory, you 22 regime. So this is first. 22 have an applicable law, and you cannot have islands of 23 Second is that the military court should not exceed 23 places with a different law. 24 the jurisdiction beyond the explicit and limited 24 Q. I apologize; I was skipping ahead. So --25 authority provided by the Geneva Convention, because it A. Okay.

Page 91 Page 89 1 Q. You've -- it's my fault. 1 A. Okay, part 2 of my -- part 2 of my opinion -- not part 2 2 You've described changes that you would make to the 2 of my opinion; this section that you were referring to 3 law to make it comply with international law? 3 is analyzing -- is the second point of my analysis, whether the courts are properly constitute as the 4 A. Yeah, not only to the law; to a policy also. 4 5 Q. And good policy. 5 requirement of a military court to -- to function and to 6 So now I want you to imagine a hypothetical in which б provide justice in criminal cases. So the first point 7 the -- starting in the year 1999, the Israeli military 7 was the point of independence and impartiality, and it's 8 8 commander and the Knesset and the prime minister all not referring to this. 9 adopted the Weill plan, and the Weill plan was exactly 9 The second point of the opinion was that why -- why 10 as you've just described it. 10 it is a not properly constituted court, because it is 11 11 So this is my hypothetical. Do you understand the shown that through the years, it becomes a political 12 hypothetical, or should I elaborate on it further? 12 court, in the sense that it's prosecuting not according 13 A. Okay, if I'm a legal adviser of the State, and -- yeah, 13 to regular territorial jurisdiction, but according to 14 14 okay. the nationality of the person. 15 Q. Right. 15 So if this point will be cured, as you propose, it 16 A. But I mean, what are --16 will simply mean that for -- the question whether the 17 O. Okay. 17 court are properly constitute. I will not say any more 18 A. Yeah, what is the question? Yeah. 18 that it is a court that is political, in that sense. 19 Q. So -- so the question is: Would any of the 21 cases 19 Q. Okay. I think I --20 20 that we've described, the 21 cases that we are here A. Just if it is cured, hypothetically, yeah. 21 about, would any of those 21 cases have come out 21 Q. I think I understand your --22 22 differently in a legal regime that you've described? A. Okay. 23 MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation, assumes facts not 23 Q. -- your views on that. 24 in evidence. 24 And is it your opinion that a -- a person who enters 25 25 A. You are asking me whether it is important if the judge into the territory of Israel and -- without a uniform, Page 92 1 1 is independent or not, if in any case they did the act, and commits acts of violence against civilians for 2 and they will be guilty. What can I answer for this? 2 political purposes, has the right not to be tried in 3 Is it a serious question? 3 a military court? BY MR. YALOWITZ: MR. SATIN: Objection to the ambiguous nature of "territory 4 4 5 5 Q. Yes, it's a very serious question. of Israel." A. Yes? To ask me it's important if the judges are 6 б You can answer, if you understand. 7 independent or not, I think it is important. 7 A. Any person who commit a crime has the right of due 8 8 Q. That wasn't the question. The question is: You've process. This is the question. And to be tried by 9 9 described -- well, let me try to be very clear. an independent, impartial and competent court. This is 10 10 You've described changes that you would make to the the requirement of international law, that the courts 11 structural regime. You talked about having Israeli 11 are independent, professional, impartial, and are rule 12 12 citizens subject to military court law; right? of due process. 13 13 A. (Witness nods.) Then, I don't know; you can constitute this as a 14 Q. You have to speak. 14 military/civilian, but these are the requirements. 15 A. Yes, yes, sorry. Yes. 15 BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. And you talked about restricting the jurisdiction of the 16 16 Q. There's nothing per se -- there's nothing per se 17 military court to --17 improper about trying a person who commits a security 18 A. Yes. 18 crime in military court; is that fair to say? 19 Q. -- things that are --19 A. According to Article 66, the occupying power can 20 A. Security. 20 establish military court to prosecute security offenses. O. -- security-related? 21 Q. So the answer is yes? 21 22 A. Yes. 22 A. Yes. We've established that already. 23 23 Q. Okay. In that -- and that would cure the issues you're Q. Okay. 24 describing in section 2 of your report; do I have that 24 I'm going to read some statements about due process, 25 right? Part 2, section 2, starting on page 13. 25 and I want to ask if you agree or disagree.

	Page 93		Page 95
1	A. Yes.	1	A. 2 the apartheid. Okay.
2	Q. Okay. "Due process, unlike some legal rules, is not	2	Q. Which begins on
3	a technical conception but a fixed content unrelated to	3	A. Segregation.
4	time, place and circumstances."	4	Q. No, no; I'm sorry.
5	Do you agree with that?	5	A. No?
6	A. I'm sorry, I don't is it possible for me to read	6	Q. Part (ii), which begins on page 9 and runs through
7	this? Or if you can read it again, more fluently	7	page 17.
8	Q. I'll read it again.	8	A. The entire section, yes.
9	A. Yeah.	9	Q. Okay.
10	Q. I'll read it again.	10	A. Yeah.
11	A. Just more yeah.	11	Q. So as I understand
12	Q. Sure.	12	A. Yes.
13	A. Sorry.	13	Q. Do you have that section in mind?
14	Q. "Due process is not a technical conception with	14	A. 1 and 2 yes, the numbers.
15	a fixed content, unrelated to time, place and	15	Q. Roman 2?
16	circumstances."	16	A. Yes, (ii), exactly.
17	A. Yes, due process is not a fixed content due process	17	Q. So as I understand your argument, you you have three
18	what do you want me to answer? If I agree	18	arguments that you make in this section. Impartiality
19	Q. Do you agree with that?	19	is the first argument you make; right? That's
20	A with this statement?	20	section 1, impartiality and independence?
21	Q. Yeah.	21	A. Lack of independence, and impartiality, yeah.
22	A. I think that any human rights that we have is a question	22	Q. And then part 2
23	of context. And yes, I will agree with this also.	23	A. 2.
24	Q. Do you agree that the requirements of due process are	24	Q is unequal treatment?
25	a function not only of the extent of the governmental	25	A. Yes sorry, can I interrupt you?
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Page 96
1	Page 94	_	
1	restriction imposed, but also of the extent of the	1	Q. Please.
2	necessity for the restriction?	2	A. Yeah, so if you want me just to structure the how it
3	MR. SATIN: Objection, compound question.	3	was constructed, so the first part deals with the why
4	WITNESS: Can I answer it?	4	they don't are not impartial and independent. So
5	MR. SATIN: Yes.	5	we're looking at the important procedure, the lack of
6	A. Human rights, generally, can be can be balanced by	6	training, and the lack of separation of powers. So this
7	necessity needs and security needs, and then one needs	7	was this part of independence and impartiality and
8	to see if the essence of the right is is not harm	8	competency; we can put it together.
9	beyond the restrictive necessity, yes, but we can agree	9	And then the second part will be the fact that as
10	on this. I mean, human rights are a balance of needs;	10	the court is a political court, because different
11	yes.	11	treatment is provided to different group of
12	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	12	nationality yeah.
13	Q. All right. I want to ask you some questions about your	13	Q. And then the third part is
14	opinion with regard to whether the military courts are	14	A. In page 17?
15	properly constituted.	15	Q. Yes.
16	A. Mm-hmm.	16	A. Yes.
17	Q. We talked about one part of that, in a section of your	17	Q. No, I'm sorry
18	report; I want to ask you about some other ones.	18	A. No?
19	First of all, is it your are you applying	19	Q in pages 16 to 17, you offer a third argument, which
20	Article 66 in that section of your report?	20	is
21	A. Which section? Sorry.	21	A. Ah, yes, this one. Yes, yes. Sorry. Yeah.
22	Q. Sure.	22	Q. Which is about laws have
23	A. The second one, or third one?	23	A. The issue of publicity, yeah.
24	Q. So the questions I'm going to ask you are limited to	24	Q. Right. The laws have to be known, published
25	part 2.	25	A. Exactly.

	Page 97		Page 99
1 .	Q and not retroactive?	1	A. So let's look at it.
2	A. Yeah.	2	Q. I suspect I do, in my
3	Q. Okay. So I want to take you through those three things	3	A. Just to be sure on the wording.
4	and ask you some questions about them.	4	Q. In my study materials.
5	A. Let's go.	5	Would you like a copy of
6	Q. With regard to impartiality and independence, the first	6	A. No, no, I don't just let's read it once again.
7	thing you point to is the appointment process?	7	Q. Shall I read it aloud?
8	A. Yes.	8	A. Yes, maybe, yeah.
9	Q. And is it is it your view that Article 66 of the	9	Q. "In case of a breach of the penal provisions promulgated
10	Fourth Geneva Convention requires the appointing power	10	by it by virtue of the second paragraph of Article 64,
11	to be a military commander?	11	the occupying power may hand over the accused to its"
12	A. It required the court to be properly constituted and	12	A. "May."
13	nonpolitical. Then, every selection process need to be	13	Q "properly constituted nonpolitical military
14	reviewed under this prism.	14	courts"
15	Q. So bear with me for a minute.	15	A. Mm-hmm.
16	Is it your view that the under Article 66, the	16	Q "on condition that said courts sit in the occupied
17	courts have to be military courts?	17	country. Courts of appeal shall preferably sit in the
18	A. Article 66 grant the authority to establish courts. So	18	occupied territory."
19	first of all, it's not an obligation; it's	19	So this confirms your view that
20	a possibility. And it will be military court in the	20	A. They may. Yeah.
21	sense that they are established by the military, because	21	Q. The military commander is permitted to establish
22	the authority granted is the military commander.	22	military courts
23	Q. So could you look with me at Reisner's report for	23	A. But not obliged to.
24	a moment.	24	Q. But I think you would also agree that if they do
25	A. Which page?	25	establish courts, they must be subject to the
1	Page 98	1	Page 100
1	Q. Pages 16 and 17.	1	supervision of the military commander?
2	A. Mm-hmm.	2	A. The court?
3	Q. If I could ask you to read do you have 16 and 17 with	3	Q. Yes.
4	you?	4	A. No, the courts are established by the military
5	A. Yes wow, it's long. No, it's 36 sorry, I'm	5	commander.
6	sorry page 16, or paragraph 16?	6	What do you mean, "supervision"? That he supervises
7	Q. Page 16, paragraph what I'd like you to do is to read	7	the judges? No, I don't think so.
8	paragraphs 36(c) and (d) only.	8	Q. So, for example, Pictet Pictet? Is that right?
9	A. Okay.	9	A. Pictet.
10	Yes, yes, this is what we said before, yeah.	10	Q. Pictet says is quoted in Reisner's paragraph 36d as
11	Only (c), you wanted me to read?	11	saying:
12	Q. (c) and (d).	12	"The accused may only be brought before 'military
13	A. (d); sorry.	13	courts', that is before courts whose members have
14	Yeah.	14	military status and are subordinate to the military
15	Q. Do you agree with Mr. Reisner's paragraphs 36(c) and	15	authorities."
16	36(d)?	16	A. Yes, it is in the sense, I think, if we continue to read
17	A. Yeah. As I said, it's the court that should be	17	his commentary, the idea is that and then we go back
18	established under the authority of the of the courts	18	to what we said before, that one cannot extend its own
19	of just again with the words, just but	19	legal system to occupied territories. This is the
20	I would yes, he mentioned "required." He did, like,	20	point. Yeah.
21	underlining "require." As I understand Article 66, the	21	Q. All right. So it's not the it's not the placement of
22	occupying power may establish the court; this is how the	22	the courts within the military structure that's you
23	language if you want to open Article 66.	23	have to criticism of that; right?
24	Do you have Article 66 with you?	24	A. This is the law. I mean
25	Q. I think I do.	25	Q. All right.

Page 101 Page 103 1 A. But the law also required it to be properly constituted 1 until 2004, the judges, prosecutor were under the same 2 2 and nonpolitical. unit, subordinate to the same structure; and then, in 3 3 Q. And your criticism is the appointment process, rather 2005, they divided the -- the units, they created the 4 than the -- rather than the supervising process? 4 special unit for the military courts, which is now in 5 A. Not only the appointment; it's all the points that 5 the branch with the other martial court, which is 6 6 I wrote in my opinion, that they are -- you know, it's separated from the prosecution, which is the minimum 7 7 every point separately, and especially the accumulation standard of -- of requirement that the prosecution and of all of these points, they make it not properly 8 8 the judges are not in the same -- in the same place. 9 9 constituted and not nonpolitical. Q. Is it your opinion that people who were convicted of 10 10 In the long run, being 44 years working like this; crimes in the military courts before the changes took 11 11 we're not talking about courts doing this for one month. place in 2004 should be released from prison because of 12 12 Hundreds of thousands of cases. the appointment procedures? 13 Q. Bear with me. 13 A. People who do not have due process have the right to be 14 14 judged by a competent tribunal and to have right to due So I -- I just want to focus with you on part 1(a). 15 A. Mm-hmm. 15 16 MR. SATIN: Mr. Yalowitz, are you now referring to 16 Then the -- you know, criminal case should be 17 Ms. Weill's report, or Mr. Reisner's? 17 reviewed and decided upon the facts. If they are 18 BY MR. YALOWITZ: 18 guilty, they are guilty; if they are not guilty, they 19 19 Q. So could I direct your attention to -are not guilty. But the point is that everyone deserves 20 A. It's my report; right? Yeah. 20 a due process, that's right. 21 21 Q. Sure. So do you think that the appointment process that Q. -- to your report, page 9. 22 existed before 2004 was so central to the core of due 22 A. Yes, my report. 23 Q. Okay. Do you have page 9 before you? 23 process that the people who were convicted of crimes 24 A. Yes. 24 under that system should be released from prison? 25 25 A. I don't remember that I said that someone should be Q. This is -- this is where you're discussing the Page 102 Page 104 1 1 appointment -released from prison. 2 A. Yes. 2 Q. I'm asking you. 3 Q. -- procedure; right? 3 A. Okay. I thought that you are referring to my other 4 And do I have it right that your criticism in this 4 answer. 5 part of your report is not related to the fact of being 5 Q. No, no; I'm asking you. 6 a military court, but is derived from the particular б A. First of all, what -- now I'm -- the question? 7 7 appointment process that you're describing; do I have Q. Do you want me to ask it again? 8 8 that right? A. Yeah. 9 9 A. Okay, appointment process and the structure, the unity Q. Sure. 10 structure, as you can see, were also changed in 2004, 10 Is it your opinion that the appointment procedures 11 because of this default. During --11 that existed before 2004 are so central to the core of 12 Q. The 2004 change was a change to the appointment 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13 procedure; right?

14 A. Both. You have one change -- I mean, the first change 15 was that during -- from '67 to 2004, you have long years 16 of situation in which the judge were appointment through 17 the recommendation of the prosecutor. That changes in 18 2004, and they establish a -- how do you say it -- an 19 appointment committee that recommends for the military 20 commander. This was --

21 Q. These --

22 A. Just -- if I may finish?

23 Q. Please, please. I apologize.

24 A. Yeah.

25

This was one change. And the second change was that

due process that people who are convicted of crimes in the military courts, who are still serving time, should be released from prison because of the appointment process?

A. I think that court -- in order to be a competent court, should have a correct procedural appointment of judges to secure their independency, impartiality, and being nonpolitical. This is the accepted rule.

Whether -- now, the military -- you are asking me, "Do you think that if a judge is not really independent, it's worth making another trial?"

These are the rules of fair trial; you know? We can't just put people in prison without any rule of fair trial, if anyway they did this. I don't know; what can

	Page 105		Page 107
1	I answer of this? For me this is was a sarcasm;	1	and then you say "I agree," or you may disagree, you say
2	yes? It's not my position.	2	you disagree. Or you may have no opinion; whatever your
3	The rule of fair trial are established to make sure	3	answer is.
4	that procedure are well conducted, and that people that	4	A. Mm-hmm.
5	are guilty will be in prison; people that are innocent	5	Q. Okay, but don't assume from my question that I'm
6	will be free. This the criminal law.	6	agreeing with you or disagreeing with you; I'm just
7	I think that court should be independent, and if	7	asking you questions. Does that make sense?
8	they are not, it is a serious problem in the due	8	A. Yes.
9	process, and maybe you should have a retrial.	9	Q. Okay.
10	Q. So	10	So are you offering any opinion at all about the
11	A. I don't know how to cure the situation; I don't have any	11	guilt or innocence of the 21 cases?
12	position on what to do with these people. I'm just	12	A. Absolutely no. I have no position on this.
13	observing that the court are not guaranteeing fair trial	13	Q. And are you offering an opinion on whether any of those
14	as a question of independency.	14	21 convicted criminals should be released from prison?
15	Q. So we we're here about 21 convictions; right?	15	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.
16	MR. SATIN: Objection. Lack of foundation. Calls for	16	A. I don't have any position on this question.
17	speculation.	17	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
18	A. I'm here for an expert opinion I gave on military	18	Q. Are you offering any opinion on whether those 21
19	courts.	19	individuals should be subject to any kind of retrial?
20	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	20	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.
21	Q. All right. You were provided the files of 21 people who	21	A. You are more generally are asking me what is the
22	were convicted of terrorism; right?	22	how to cure a situation in which military courts which
23	MR. SATIN: Objection, asked and answered, lack of	23	are not properly constitute provide sentence and
24	foundation.	24	decision. I'm not I don't know. I don't know what
25	A. I was sent the link to the cases, yeah.	25	to do with it now. I'm just observing it and telling
	Page 106		Page 108
1	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	1	you that these process are not according to
2	Q. Okay. And most of those people were convicted before	2	international standard of due process. I'm not here
3	2004?	3	I'm not the legal adviser on how how to cure the
4	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.	4	situation. I don't know.
5	A. Yeah, this, I'm sorry, I told you, I don't know.	5	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
6	I don't remember the fact. I have not any particular	6	Q. Do you do you have any opinion at all about whether
7	position on these specific trials.	7	any of the 21 verdicts is reliable?
8	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	8	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.
9	Q. Are you advocating that any of those 21 individuals were	9	A. Of course not. I didn't read the cases. I don't know.
10	actually innocent?	10	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
11	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.	11	Q. So do you know whether, in any of the 21 cases, there
12	A. Is that what you I don't know.	12	was a judge on the court who had no legal training?
13	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	13	A. I don't know this.
14	Q. No, no, I'm asking	14	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.
15	A. I didn't read the cases.	15	A. Yeah. This could be checked, but I have no idea.
16	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	16	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
17	Q. I'm asking I'm just asking the question.	17	Q. Do you know whether, in any of the 21 cases, there was
18	A. Yeah.	18	a rule change in the middle of trial?
19	Q. You shouldn't assume from my answer that I believe	19	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.
20	you	20	A. Of course I can have no idea. I don't know when the
21	A. No, no, so if I think that	21	trial were taken, and most importantly, I don't know the
22 23	Q feel a certain way let me speak. Let me speak.	22 23	rules. You know? It's so difficult to know when they were published, and et cetera. This would require real
23 24	I'm going to ask you questions, and you just answer from your heart. Don't assume that I believe I'm not	23 24	were published, and et cetera. This would require real work.
25	arguing; I'm just asking questions. So you may agree,	25	WORK. BY MR. YALOWITZ:
ر ت	argaing, ringuist abaning questions. 50 you may agree,	2)	D 1 1/111, 1/1110 ((1112),

	Page 109		Page 111
1	Q. So so the answer is you	1	be disregarded?
2	A. No.	2	A. No. No. No, no, the I didn't did not write this.
3	Q. You don't know?	3	I think maybe if you read the last paragraph, you
4	A. I don't know.	4	can understand my my position.
5	Q. I want to ask you about a statement you make on page 11	5	Q. Is it more of a rhetorical point, that
6	of your report.	6	A. No. No. No, no. The issue is that because IHL is
7	A. Yeah.	7	let's say that the establishment of military court to
8	Q. You write on page 11:	8	try civilians, it is an exception of the general rule
9	"Human rights law, which was developed after the	9	that civilians shall not be tried by military court; we
10	drafting of the Geneva Conventions, prohibits the trial	10	agree on this?
11	of civilians by military courts exactly because they	11	Q. Okay.
12	generally do not comply with the requirement of	12	A. Yeah?
13	an independent and impartial judiciary."	13	Q. I understand that.
14	Did I read that correctly?	14	A. Yeah. So from this, the idea that if we have an
15	A. Yeah, it's what I wrote what I wrote.	15	exception, it should be restricted; it should be framed
16	Q. And so I'm you're making a distinction there between	16	within its own authority and not first not enlarged,
17	human rights law on the one hand and international	17	and second, to understand this authority in the context
18	humanitarian law on the other hand.	18	which it was provided, which is the law of military
19	A. Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. Yes.	19	occupation, equal temporary situation, transit
20	Q. And what is the point that you're making in this	20	situation, and not possible to have these trials that
21	sentence? Because I didn't understand it.	21	are illegal according to human rights law to generate an
22	A. The general rule is that military courts would not reach	22	entire population, including children, for 45 years.
23	the requirement of independency and impartiality	23	Q. So is that an argument about independence, or does
24	structurally, according to human rights law; and	24	that really go more toward limiting the scope to
25	therefore the requirement of human rights law is that	25	security crimes?
	Page 110		Page 112
1	civilians, generally, yes, should not be tried in a	1	A. Both.
2	military court.	2	Q. How does it relate to independence?
3	Now, we have the IHL provision that is allowing	3	A. Here I provide a citation why the human rights law said
4	this yes, we agree, Article 66 so here we can see	4	this; you can read them in footnote no, sorry, it's
5	there is a kind of not a kind; there is a clash	5	not here. Let me show you in footnote 35, for
6	between these two branches of law. Right?	6	example. And in the text you can write it and in
7	Then what do we do with the clash of two norms? So	7	the text that is before footnote 36, that is customary
8	in order to resolve a clash of norm in international	8	law, ICRC customary law study.
9	law, you have two positions, or two two ways of doing	9	Q. So right; I appreciate that.
10	it. One is that the later norm prevail on the former	10	A. Yeah, I mean yeah.
11	norm; the other one is the lex specialis, that we	11	Q. And I read it.
12	discussed, later.	12	A. Yeah, exactly, so yeah.
13	But anyway, the point was to show that there is	13	Q. But what I'm not understanding is, it sounds like the
14	a problem of independency in military courts.	14	sources you've brought
15	Q. That so	15	A. Yeah.
16	A. Yeah, I mean, I don't know where we didn't what	16	Q in this report are saying, as a matter of human
17	that you don't understand?	17	rights law in the world, it's a bad idea to have
18	Q. I'm sorry?	18	military courts because of independence concerns.
19	A. What did you didn't you understand?	19	A. Right.
20	Q. Which word didn't I understand?	20	Q. Is that a fair summary?
21	A. Yeah.	21	A. Yeah.
22	Q. So	22	Q. And then there's a special situation, which is described
23	A. The point, you didn't understand.	23	by IHL, which is when there is an occupation, if the
o .			
24 25	Q. So I I guess I didn't understand the point. Are you arguing that Article 66 has become obsolete and should	24 25	foreign military chooses to establish a court for security purposes, then that court must be a military

Page 113 Page 115 1 1 (Reporter clarification.). court. 2 2 MR. SATIN: Objection, compound. MR. YALOWITZ: "Until there's a political agreement." 3 3 BY MR. YALOWITZ: A. And the occupation. And -- so during this period, you Q. Do I have that right? are granted this -- this authority which can today, in 4 4 5 A. Article -- IHL allow the creation of military courts; 5 an anachronistic view, be seen as a provision that will 6 б yes, you had it -- this is true. not comply to human rights law. And, by the way, maybe 7 7 We have to remember that human rights law has been today it wouldn't have been drafted like this; but 8 8 developed after the Geneva Convention. So that means I don't know. This is a speculation. 9 9 that the Geneva Convention -- the -- should be Anyway, the point is that during that time, yes, you 10 10 interpreted in light of developing human rights law, and may do this, because there is a sense of emergency, 11 11 this is how things have been made. there is chaos, you need to establish your authority. 12 12 45 years doing it, you could -- you may also not do So through that the authority in itself, until there 13 is not another provision that will repeal IHL, exists; 13 this, and provide a better court, in the sense of being but then we must view the function, jurisdiction, the 14 14 independent, impartial, and applying a law with --15 long-term function, in light of human rights law, which 15 involve better due process than we have today. 16 is another body of law which applied on the occupation 16 Because, frankly, what can be a justification not to 17 in the West Bank. 17 have a due process right? What can be a justification 18 Q. So if you were the legal adviser to the nation of 18 not to have independent judge? No justification. No 19 19 Israel -situation can bring to have nonindependent court. It's 20 A. Lots of things will change. 20 simply nothing. You don't need trials, then; just --21 Q. How -- if they -- and they took your advice, which 21 you know, put people in jail, and this is it. 22 22 they --Q. Anything else? 23 A. Can you recommend me? 23 A. I mean -- so I don't -- the point how to cure the 24 Q. With pleasure. I don't know if you're familiar with 24 situation, I would do other courts. 25 this, but legal advisers are not always obeyed, you 25 Q. Would you have -- what kind of courts would you have? Page 114 Page 116 A. I mean, why should -- I need now to think alternatives 1 1 know. 2 2 to the existing military courts? Is this -- yeah? But suppose you were the legal adviser --3 3 Q. I'm just asking. A. I need to think about that. It's a big question, you 4 Q. -- for the State of Israel, and they were -- they were 4 5 5 know. I can do a proposal for the Israeli State, if planning to obey you, how would you -- if they said, б they need it, you know. 6 "Look, we'll obey you, but we just cannot end the 7 7 occupation today. It's too complicated, there's too Q. All right. 8 8 many factors; we just can't do it. But we want to have A. No, I mean ... 9 9 as good of a system as possible governing the security Q. Is there any case you're aware of that holds that human 10 rights law prohibits the trial of civilians by military 10 laws, because we want to prosecute terrorists, we want 11 to give them a fair trial, and then, if they're 11 12 A. What if there is human rights law -- what? 12 convicted, we'll punish them; but we really do want to 13 Q. Sure. Do you know of a case --13 give them as fair a trial as we can in a court that's 14 structurally sound as we can. How would you reconcile 14 A. Yeah? 15 -- what recommendations would you make to reconcile 15 Q. -- a decision by a court that says human rights law 16 prohibits the trial of civilians by any military court? 16 Article 66, on the one hand, with the human rights law 17 17 A. There were a decision of the Human Rights Committee on norms that you've described on pages 11 and 12?" 18 A. Before I go back to Article 66, you remember I was 18 this -- Human Rights Committee on this issue. The Human Rights Committee is the -- the treaty body established 19 speaking about they may bring them to military court. 19 by the UN commission -- the UN covenant on civil and 20 Now -- so there is a sense of -- kind of emergency in 20 21 this article. You see, you are in the middle -- you are political rights, stated the possibility to send 21 22 in the middle of the war; the occupation starts; you 22 communication to this committee. 23 23 still have major occupation issue to -- the security Now, they are not a binding court, but they give 24 24 decisions, and it's written by law professors, and there issue to regulate. You know, occupation can take one 25 year, two years, until there is political agreement --25 was two or three cases in the context of the Turkey

	Page 117		Page 119
1 .	military courts, if I'm not wrong. I can have the I	1	Committee was cited in several cases by the because
2	think maybe here, even, I have the citation, if you need	2	they form what we call the customary law, so it's law,
3	me to look one second.	3	right? We have more and more decision, opinions, and
4	Yes oh, here, it was even sorry.	4	yeah.
5	Yes, exactly. So it's not only the Human Rights	5	So they are binding for the litigating party, but
6	Commission; it's even the European Court of Human	6	today, international law is also is influenced by
7	Rights, with this is so I noted the Human Rights	7	different things. As you can see, the High Court of
8	Committee, and you have also the European Court of Human	8	Justice, which refer more than one time to their
9	Rights in Sahin versus Turkey.	9	decisions.
10	Q. What page are you on?	10	Q. Is the you read the United States Supreme Court in
11	A. Page 400 on my 2007 article, footnote 17. It's a case	11	Hamdan; right?
12	from 2001. Footnote 17.	12	A. Yeah.
13	Q. Okay, thank you.	13	Q. You talked about it in your report?
14	Are you aware of the other cases this paragraph	14	A. Yeah, I studied this, yeah.
15	says "See for example"?	15	Q. It was it was an important case
16	A. Yeah. So there is a Human Rights Committee decision.	16	A. Important.
17	I don't remember by heart the references, but there are.	17	Q in the United States.
18	Q. And that's the committee that's referenced in you	18	A. Very good case, yeah.
19	quote that committee in your report?	19	Q. Yeah. And was did you read the briefs in that case
20	A. It's possible. Let me I don't remember.	20	as well?
21	Q. So just directing your attention to	21	A. Not a lot not not all of them, because there are
22	A. Yeah, here, yeah, footnote no, this is a general	22	a lot; that's what I meant. Not all of them, because
23	comment.	23	there are a lot. Some of them I read; not everything.
24	Q. Bear with me. I just had it directing your attention	24	Q. Did anybody make the argument in that case that
25	to page 12.	25	international human rights law prohibits the trial of
	Page 118		Page 120
1	Page 118 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah.	1	
1 2	A. Yeah, exactly, yeah.		civilians by any military court?
	A. Yeah, exactly, yeah.Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN	1 2 3	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't
2	A. Yeah, exactly, yeah.Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe	2	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions.
2	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights 	2	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised
2 3 4	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? 	2 3 4	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you?
2 3 4 5	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights 	2 3 4 5	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision?
2 3 4 5 6	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on 	2 3 4 5 6	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you?
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to 	2 3 4 5 6 7	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. Q. And is the United States a party to this is it due to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open, because they referred to the general rule of civilized
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. Q. And is the United States a party to this is it due to a convention, or what is it? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open, because they referred to the general rule of civilized state, or whatever yeah, I don't remember the exact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. Q. And is the United States a party to this is it due to a convention, or what is it? A. Yeah, it's the convention the UN Convention of Political and Civil Rights, which in which they are a party. But then you need to accept the communication 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open, because they referred to the general rule of civilized state, or whatever yeah, I don't remember the exact thing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. Q. And is the United States a party to this is it due to a convention, or what is it? A. Yeah, it's the convention the UN Convention of Political and Civil Rights, which in which they are a party. But then you need to accept the communication process. But anyway, the Human Rights Committee is an 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open, because they referred to the general rule of civilized state, or whatever yeah, I don't remember the exact thing. Q. I mean, the the issue in Hamdan A. Yeah. Q was that there was a special constituted military
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. Q. And is the United States a party to this is it due to a convention, or what is it? A. Yeah, it's the convention the UN Convention of Political and Civil Rights, which in which they are a party. But then you need to accept the communication process. But anyway, the Human Rights Committee is an organ created from this convention, which they're 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open, because they referred to the general rule of civilized state, or whatever yeah, I don't remember the exact thing. Q. I mean, the the issue in Hamdan A. Yeah. Q was that there was a special constituted military court that had rules that the Supreme Court found
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. Q. And is the United States a party to this is it due to a convention, or what is it? A. Yeah, it's the convention the UN Convention of Political and Civil Rights, which in which they are a party. But then you need to accept the communication process. But anyway, the Human Rights Committee is an organ created from this convention, which they're a party of. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open, because they referred to the general rule of civilized state, or whatever yeah, I don't remember the exact thing. Q. I mean, the the issue in Hamdan A. Yeah. Q was that there was a special constituted military court that had rules that the Supreme Court found offensive; is that fair to say? Or at least the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. Q. And is the United States a party to this is it due to a convention, or what is it? A. Yeah, it's the convention the UN Convention of Political and Civil Rights, which in which they are a party. But then you need to accept the communication process. But anyway, the Human Rights Committee is an organ created from this convention, which they're a party of. And now what is interesting in this decision, like 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open, because they referred to the general rule of civilized state, or whatever yeah, I don't remember the exact thing. Q. I mean, the the issue in Hamdan A. Yeah. Q was that there was a special constituted military court that had rules that the Supreme Court found offensive; is that fair to say? Or at least the majority of the Supreme Court found offensive.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. Q. You you referenced the general comments of the UN Human Rights Committee. And are you saying you believe there are some advisory opinions by the UN Human Rights Committee that that would comment on this topic? A. It's not advisory opinion; it's what we call decision on communication. It's like the victims and the case to the Human Rights Committee, and they give decision yes. I if my memory is I'm, like, almost certain that they have there are a few cases of the Human Rights Committee. Q. And is it is it a binding decision, or is it a precatory decision? A. It's a binding decision for the states before them. Q. And is the United States a party to this is it due to a convention, or what is it? A. Yeah, it's the convention the UN Convention of Political and Civil Rights, which in which they are a party. But then you need to accept the communication process. But anyway, the Human Rights Committee is an organ created from this convention, which they're a party of. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	civilians by any military court? A. I don't remember. I don't I you know, I don't remember the briefs. I mean, I read the decisions. Q. I didn't see it in I didn't see that argument raised in the decisions. Did you? A. In the decision? Q. Yeah. A. No, in the decision, they referred to the general practice of maybe what we can refer to the the customary law, they refer to Protocol 1, for example, that the US is even not a party to; but they recognized that Article 75 constituted customary law. And indeed, most of the due process rule are reflected there. But I think they they left this more open, because they referred to the general rule of civilized state, or whatever yeah, I don't remember the exact thing. Q. I mean, the the issue in Hamdan A. Yeah. Q was that there was a special constituted military court that had rules that the Supreme Court found offensive; is that fair to say? Or at least the

	Page 121		Page 123
1 .	A I'm following until the end. If you want, I can tell	1	Q snuck into the United States. Do you recall that
2	you what I but repeat this again?	2	case?
3	Q. Sure.	3	A. Mm-hmm. Yes.
4	So the facts in Hamdan were Hamdan is a case	4	Q. And they were they were apprehended, and they were
5	about Guantanamo Bay	5	remitted to a military tribunal for trial; right?
6	A. Yeah.	6	A. Yeah. What year was it? I can't recall exactly.
7	Q detainees; right? And Hamdan was to be tried by	7	Q. Does 1942 sound right to you?
8	a specially constituted military court. Right?	8	A. '42? Yeah, maybe, yeah.
9	A. Right.	9	Q. And by 1942, the United States had entered the war.
10	Q. And he objected to that on the basis of a number of	10	A. Mm-hmm. Yeah.
11	things, including international humanitarian law; right?	11	Q. And and the argument in Quirin by the defendants was
12	A. Right.	12	that they should be tried in a civilian court rather
13	Q. And in fact the a majority of the Supreme Court	13	than military court; does that sound right to you?
14	agreed with Hamdan that the specially constituted	14	A. Mm-hmm. Yeah.
15	military commission violated international humanitarian	15	Q. And the Supreme Court rejected that argument; right?
16	law, for a number of reasons; right?	16	A. Yeah.
17	A. Yes. They violated Article 3; they were not properly	17	Q. And then in Hamdan, the Supreme Court relied on Quirin;
18	constituted. Yeah.	18	is that right?
19	Q. For example, they criticized the idea that it would be	19	A. I don't remember in what context. Can you recall me the
20	okay to try a person for a crime and not allow him to be	20	content
21	present	21	Q. Yeah, I don't remember either.
22	A. Yeah, in that sense.	22	A. Maybe we need to read the paragraph related, yeah.
23	Q to see the evidence; right?	23 24	Q. Yeah. We'll we'll look for it
24 25	A. Right.	25	A. Yeah.Q at the lunch break.
<u> </u>	Q. Okay. Did did any of did the opinion in the case	45	-
	Page 122		Page 124
1	in any way treat the topic of whether the whole idea of		
_		1	A. Yeah. Okay.
2	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper,	2	Q. And we can resume
3	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court?	2	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah.
3 4	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no.	2 3 4	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time
3 4 5	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember	2 3 4 5	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also.
3 4 5 6	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer?	2 3 4 5 6	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take
3 4 5 6 7	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break.
3 4 5 6 7 8	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to exhibit 4, which we've placed before you, which is the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important there. Q. Agreed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to exhibit 4, which we've placed before you, which is the Hamdan case; right?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important there. Q. Agreed. So they relied on a case from the 1940s called	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to exhibit 4, which we've placed before you, which is the Hamdan case; right? A. Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important there. Q. Agreed. So they relied on a case from the 1940s called Quirin; do you recall that case?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to exhibit 4, which we've placed before you, which is the Hamdan case; right? A. Yes. Q. And if you go to page 28.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important there. Q. Agreed. So they relied on a case from the 1940s called Quirin; do you recall that case? A. Mm-hmm. Yeah. Q. Are you familiar with that case? A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to exhibit 4, which we've placed before you, which is the Hamdan case; right? A. Yes. Q. And if you go to page 28. Just to orient you, do you see we're in part 5 of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important there. Q. Agreed. So they relied on a case from the 1940s called Quirin; do you recall that case? A. Mm-hmm. Yeah. Q. Are you familiar with that case? A. Yeah. Q. That's a case in which German military officers snuck	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to exhibit 4, which we've placed before you, which is the Hamdan case; right? A. Yes. Q. And if you go to page 28. Just to orient you, do you see we're in part 5 of the principal opinion? A. Yes. Q. And then if you turn the next page, they are discussing
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important there. Q. Agreed. So they relied on a case from the 1940s called Quirin; do you recall that case? A. Mm-hmm. Yeah. Q. Are you familiar with that case? A. Yeah. Q. That's a case in which German military officers snuck into the United States, right, or German military	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to exhibit 4, which we've placed before you, which is the Hamdan case; right? A. Yes. Q. And if you go to page 28. Just to orient you, do you see we're in part 5 of the principal opinion? A. Yes. Q. And then if you turn the next page, they are discussing Quirin; right?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	trying Hamdan in a military court was somehow improper, and that he should only be tried in a civilian court? A. No. If I remember well, no. Q. And I can't remember A. Sorry, can I complete my answer? Q. Yeah, yeah, please. A. The answer is "no," and exactly the issue was whether this court are properly constituted. Q. Correct. A. Yeah, and Q. I agree with that. A. And then they review it not only according to IHL, but I think you know, domestic US law was very important there. Q. Agreed. So they relied on a case from the 1940s called Quirin; do you recall that case? A. Mm-hmm. Yeah. Q. Are you familiar with that case? A. Yeah. Q. That's a case in which German military officers snuck	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. And we can resume A. Yeah. MR. SATIN: Is perhaps now a good time A. Yeah, perhaps. I need to go to the toilet also. MR. YALOWITZ: I think so. Yeah, let's let's take a lunch break. (12:45 p.m.) (Lunch break taken.) (Exhibit 4 marked for identification.) BY MR. YALOWITZ: Q. So before we went to take lunch, we were talking about the citation in Quirin I'm sorry, in Hamdan, of Quirin. So I just wanted to direct your attention to exhibit 4, which we've placed before you, which is the Hamdan case; right? A. Yes. Q. And if you go to page 28. Just to orient you, do you see we're in part 5 of the principal opinion? A. Yes. Q. And then if you turn the next page, they are discussing

	Page 125		Page 127
1	Court in Hamdan found Quirin to continue to be good law,	1	A. Mm-hmm.
2	and relied on it to the degree stated in the opinion?	2	Q. Right? You have to say
3	MR. SATIN: Well, objection, improper refreshing of	3	A. Yeah, but in the okay, but in the context of Hamdan,
4	recollection.	4	I we need more time to to read this.
5	But you can answer.	5	Q. Okay. That's okay; I think it's enough.
6	A. I I would need to more time to read what exactly	6	A. Enough okay.
7	they rely on Quirin, in what context. Like this,	7	Q. Okay. Can we turn to the interim agreement between the
8	I can't really recall what was that, so maybe if you ask	8	PA and the PLO?
9	me a more specific question?	9	A. Yeah, sure.
10	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	10	Q. You're familiar with it; right?
11	Q. Sure. I I don't think it's actually very important.	11	A. Yeah.
12	A. Okay.	12	Q. Have you read the provisions dealing with criminal
13	Q. I just felt, as a courtesy, since you had asked about	13	jurisdiction?
14	where in the opinion it might be, I would show it to	14	A. I read it. I read them not yesterday; it was quite
15	you. But if it doesn't refresh your memory, that's	15	long time ago. But yes, of course, I read them.
16	okay.	16	I can't recall every word, but yes, of course I read
17	A. No, but what was the question?	17	them.
18	Q. Were they in Hamdan, were they citing Quirin with	18	Q. Do you recall generally that the interim agreement
19	approval?	19	required the redeployment of Israeli military forces out
20	A. If if I recall well, I mean, wasn't Quirin brought in	20	of what they called Area A?
21	the context of the whether conspiracy constitutes	21	A. Yes.
22	a crime, a war crime?	22	Q. And it required the creation of a PA judicial system;
23	I mean, I'm not sure it was brought as to the	23	right?
24	question whether commission are are well set.	24	A. Yeah.
25	Q. It's all right. If you don't remember off the top of	25	Q. Palestinian Authority judicial system? Is that right?
	Page 126		Page 128
1	Page 126 your head, it's not important.	1	Page 128 A. Yes.
1 2		1 2	
	your head, it's not important.		A. Yes.
2	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue.	2	A. Yes.Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military
2	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you.	2	A. Yes.Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right?
2 3 4	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm.	2 3 4	A. Yes.Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right?A. Yes.
2 3 4 5	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the	2 3 4 5	A. Yes.Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right?A. Yes.Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative
2 3 4 5 6	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that?	2 3 4 5 6	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its
2 3 4 5 6 7	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan?	2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think. Q. Quirin	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government retained surely included the criminal jurisdiction set
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think. Q. Quirin A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government retained surely included the criminal jurisdiction set out in the annex to the interim agreement; right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think. Q. Quirin A. Yeah. Q. Do you recall that Quirin was a case about enemy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government retained surely included the criminal jurisdiction set out in the annex to the interim agreement; right? A. Mm-hmm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think. Q. Quirin A. Yeah. Q. Do you recall that Quirin was a case about enemy combatants who went to the United States, and they were apprehended while they were in the United States A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government retained surely included the criminal jurisdiction set out in the annex to the interim agreement; right? A. Mm-hmm. Q. Do you recall A. It was annex 4, I think; right? Q. I was going to ask you if you recall annex 4.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think. Q. Quirin A. Yeah. Q. Do you recall that Quirin was a case about enemy combatants who went to the United States, and they were apprehended while they were in the United States A. Yeah. Q not in uniform?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government retained surely included the criminal jurisdiction set out in the annex to the interim agreement; right? A. Mm-hmm. Q. Do you recall A. It was annex 4, I think; right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think. Q. Quirin A. Yeah. Q. Do you recall that Quirin was a case about enemy combatants who went to the United States, and they were apprehended while they were in the United States A. Yeah. Q not in uniform? A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government retained surely included the criminal jurisdiction set out in the annex to the interim agreement; right? A. Mm-hmm. Q. Do you recall A. It was annex 4, I think; right? Q. I was going to ask you if you recall annex 4. A. Yeah. Q. All right. And you would agree with me that by 1995,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think. Q. Quirin A. Yeah. Q. Do you recall that Quirin was a case about enemy combatants who went to the United States, and they were apprehended while they were in the United States A. Yeah. Q not in uniform? A. Yeah. Q. And the question in Quirin was, was it appropriate in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government retained surely included the criminal jurisdiction set out in the annex to the interim agreement; right? A. Mm-hmm. Q. Do you recall A. It was annex 4, I think; right? Q. I was going to ask you if you recall annex 4. A. Yeah. Q. All right. And you would agree with me that by 1995, the PLO and its negotiators were well aware of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your head, it's not important. A. Okay. So let's continue. Q. Okay. I just felt duty bound to show it to you. A. Mm-hmm. Q. All right. We discussed briefly earlier today the interim agreement; do you recall that? A. I'm sorry, so we finished about Hamdan? Q. Yes. A. Yeah, so it wasn't any no, because I recall you asked me a question before we went to to the break. Q. I think I asked you, did they rely on Quirin? A. Ah, but for whether it was properly constitute the the court, Quirin was brought in another context, I think. Q. Quirin A. Yeah. Q. Do you recall that Quirin was a case about enemy combatants who went to the United States, and they were apprehended while they were in the United States A. Yeah. Q not in uniform? A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes. Q. And it also provided that the Israeli military government would continue in areas B and C; right? A. Yes. Q. And that Israel would retain the necessary legislative judicial and executive powers required to fulfill its obligations and rights under the interim agreement; is that right? A. Yes. Q. And do you recall that Israel, through its military government, had the powers and responsibilities that were not transferred to the PA? A. Yes. Q. Now, the judicial powers that the military government retained surely included the criminal jurisdiction set out in the annex to the interim agreement; right? A. Mm-hmm. Q. Do you recall A. It was annex 4, I think; right? Q. I was going to ask you if you recall annex 4. A. Yeah. Q. All right. And you would agree with me that by 1995,

	Page 129		Page 131
1 .	right?	1	Q. Well, the my specific question is this: So we're
2	A. If the PLO were aware of the military court?	2	talking about an agreement between Israel and the PLO.
3	Q. Yes.	3	A. Mm-hmm.
4	A. I can imagine, yeah.	4	Q. Right?
5	Q. How could they not have been; right?	5	You have to say
6	A. Yes, I mean I think	6	A. Yes. Yes.
7	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation.	7	Q. And they the PLO understood that the military courts
8	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	8	existed; right?
9	Q. You can answer.	9	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation.
10	A. If they were aware of the for sure they were aware of	10	A. I don't know what it has to do with the interim
11	existence. To tell you they know every legal structure	11	agreement, anyway.
12	of the military court, this, I cannot answer. For sure	12	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
13	they know they exist.	13	Q. Just bear with me.
14	Q. So you recall that under annex 4, and under the interim	14	A. I don't know what they understood. I wasn't entering
15	agreement, Israel had the overriding responsibility for	15	the negotiation.
16	security for the purpose of protecting Israelis and	16	Q. It wasn't the military courts were not secret; right?
17	confronting the threat of terrorism?	17	A. No, they existed at that time; on this, we can agree.
18	A. Yes.	18	Q. I mean, it was it was open, and notorious, and
19	Q. And that Israel had sole criminal jurisdiction over	19	anybody
20	offenses relating to Israel's security interests?	20	A. They were known.
21	A. Yes.	21	MR. SATIN: Objection
22	Q. The interim agreement provided that Israel was to	22	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
23	continue to carry the responsibility for overall	23	Q. They were well known; right?
24	security of Israelis; is that right?	24	MR. SATIN: Objection, compound question.
25	A. Yes, from the jurisdiction of Israelis, yeah.	25	MR. YALOWITZ: Too many people speaking at once.
	Page 130		Page 132
1	Q. But not just jurisdiction over Israeli individuals, but	1	Q. They were well known; right?
2	responsibility for the overall security of Israelis;	2	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation.
3	right?	3	A. They were known, I think so, yeah.
4	A. Probably I don't remember the wording, but I imagine,	4	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
5	if you were reading the provision of the interim	5	Q. And and in the interim agreement, Israel and the PLO
6	agreement, so yes.	6	agreed that Israel, through its military government,
7	MR. SATIN: Don't guess.	7	would retain its judicial functions for security
8	WITNESS: Okay.	8	purposes; right?
9	A. No, but I mean	9	A. Yeah. They also agreed that the settlements will
10	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	10	continue. Yeah.
11	Q. It's not controversial; right?	11	Q. And and so when when a legal document uses words
12	A. Yes.	12	like "continue" and "retain," does that suggest some
13	Q. You recall that the interim agreement provided that both	13	form of ratification to you of the existing system, at
14	sides were to act to ensure the immediate, efficient and	14	least insofar as the PLO and the PA were concerned?
15	effective handling of any incident involving a threat or	15	A. Ratification in the sense that they think they are
	• •	1 /	1 '4' 4 1 1' 0
16	act of terrorism?	16	legitimate bodies?
17	act of terrorism? A. Legal assistance, you mean?	17	Q. Yes.
17 18	act of terrorism? A. Legal assistance, you mean? Q. Yeah.	17 18	Q. Yes. A. I don't think so. I think this is a question of
17 18 19	act of terrorism? A. Legal assistance, you mean? Q. Yeah. A. Yeah, there was something about regulation about	17 18 19	Q. Yes.A. I don't think so. I think this is a question of negotiation, you know, and for example, Israel
17 18 19 20	act of terrorism? A. Legal assistance, you mean? Q. Yeah. A. Yeah, there was something about regulation about again, I can't recall by heart, but there was some	17 18 19 20	Q. Yes.A. I don't think so. I think this is a question of negotiation, you know, and for example, Israel continued to to hold control over settlements, and
17 18 19 20 21	act of terrorism? A. Legal assistance, you mean? Q. Yeah. A. Yeah, there was something about regulation about again, I can't recall by heart, but there was some provision on that.	17 18 19 20 21	Q. Yes. A. I don't think so. I think this is a question of negotiation, you know, and for example, Israel continued to to hold control over settlements, and I don't think that the PLO will think that settlement
17 18 19 20 21 22	act of terrorism? A. Legal assistance, you mean? Q. Yeah. A. Yeah, there was something about regulation about again, I can't recall by heart, but there was some provision on that. Q. Do you do you want to see it? Should I show it to	17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Yes. A. I don't think so. I think this is a question of negotiation, you know, and for example, Israel continued to to hold control over settlements, and I don't think that the PLO will think that settlement are legitimate under international law. But you
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	act of terrorism? A. Legal assistance, you mean? Q. Yeah. A. Yeah, there was something about regulation about again, I can't recall by heart, but there was some provision on that. Q. Do you do you want to see it? Should I show it to you?	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Yes. A. I don't think so. I think this is a question of negotiation, you know, and for example, Israel continued to to hold control over settlements, and I don't think that the PLO will think that settlement are legitimate under international law. But you know, those were the negotiation. When you are
17 18 19 20 21 22	act of terrorism? A. Legal assistance, you mean? Q. Yeah. A. Yeah, there was something about regulation about again, I can't recall by heart, but there was some provision on that. Q. Do you do you want to see it? Should I show it to	17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Yes. A. I don't think so. I think this is a question of negotiation, you know, and for example, Israel continued to to hold control over settlements, and I don't think that the PLO will think that settlement are legitimate under international law. But you

	Page 133		Page 135
1	Q. You think that the continuation of the military courts	1	Q. I'm sorry: Article 17.
2	was a condition accepted by the PLO in the interim	2	A. Oh, okay. I'm a bit lost.
3	agreement?	3	Do you have the number of the page? No?
4	MR. SATIN: Objection, calls for speculation.	4	Q. Page 18.
5	A. I don't know. I don't know anything about these	5	A. 18 here? I'm sorry; is this the right one? This is
6	negotiations. I don't know.	6	the protocol do you want the protocol?
7	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	7	Q. Yeah, yeah, perfect no, no, that's good.
8	Q. Well, I'm not speaking of the	8	A. No? This one?
9	A. Yeah.	9	Q. So to start, while we look at that so do you see
10	Q negotiations themselves; I mean, in an agreement, we	10	chapter 3, "Legal Affairs," toward the bottom?
11	have to go by the text of the agreement?	11	No, no, it's it's on page 18.
12	A. I agree.	12	A. Ah, chapter 3; I was looking for the Roman number.
13	Q. So when the agreement uses words like "continue" and	13	Sorry.
14	"retain" to describe the relationship between the	14	Q. And then Roman 17, which is really impossible to see;
15	military courts and security crimes, isn't that a tipoff	15	it's jurisdiction. Right?
16	to you that the PLO was agreeing that those entities	16	A. Yes.
17	should continue until further agreement is reached?	17	Q. And then if we turn to paragraph 4, you see 4.a.:
18	MR. SATIN: Objection, lack of foundation.	18	"Israel, through its military government, has the
19	You can answer, if you can.	19	authority over areas that are not under the territorial
20	A. Maybe they will they agreed that their existence will	20	jurisdiction of the Council, powers and responsibilities
21	continue, but again, it's not accepting that they are	21	not transferred to the Council and Israelis."
22	legitimate and legal bodies.	22	Are you with me?
23	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	23	A. Yes, of course, yes.
24	Q. Well, remember we talked earlier about how parties can	24	Q. And then 4b:
25	reach agreement on the expression of various	25	"To this end, the Israeli military government shall
	·		
-	Page 134	1	Page 136
1	international norms?	1	retain the necessary legislative, judicial and executive
2	A. Yeah.	2	powers and responsibilities, in accordance with
3	Q. And so isn't this an example of that?	3	international law."
4	A. Of what? That	4	Right?
5	Q. Sure. So	5	A. Yeah, this is the this is the authority as an
6	A. Yeah. Read me maybe here it's worth reading the	6	occupying power.
7	exact phrase that referred to the military court.	7	Q. Right.
8	Q. Sure. So why don't we give you	8	A. Yes.
9	A. I'm sorry about all these photocopies.	9	Q. So so the doesn't this suggest to you that both
10	Q. Yeah. No, that's okay. I'll give you the interim	10	sides understood that the military courts would
11	agreement.	11	continue?
12	A. Just the provision we are talking about, the military	12	MR. SATIN: Objection. It's a compound question and calls
13	court, specifically.	13	for speculation.
14	MR. YALOWITZ: So we can mark these as 5 and 6. The interim	14	A. Yeah, it's exactly. And it says I hope I think
15	agreement is 5, and annex 4 is 6.	15	that's what is written here. If I read it as a legal
16	(Exhibits 5 and 6 marked for identification.)	16	observer, it's that the that the Israeli government
17	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	17	keeps its authority as an occupying power within the
18	Q. So so you want me to take you through the things	18	territory which were not transferred to the council.
19	A. No, just the relevant for the you say that they	19	Q. And on and over powers and responsibilities not
20	agreed that the military courts are what is	20	transferred to the council; right?
21	Q. So so just directing your attention in the main	21	A. Yeah. Right.
22	agreement to 17.4(b).	22	Q. Which included security matters; right?
23	A. Page 17?	23	A. In Area B? Yeah.
			O W 11 4 4 4 D 1 4 11 11
24 25	Q. No, no. A. No?	24 25	Q. Well, not just Area B, but overall overall responsibility for security

	Page 137		Page 139
1	A. Yes.	1	A. Yes, yes. You read the article.
2	Q and prevention of terrorism	2	Q. And then if we flip back to the main agreement, and we
3	A. Yes.	3	look at Article XIII, that might just square the circle
4	Q was not transferred; right?	4	here.
5	A. Yes.	5	Article XIII, 2.a, Article XIII, page 16, second
6	Q. And so in order to effect its continuing rights and	6	sentence:
7	obligations with regard to security crimes, the State of	7	"Israel shall have the overriding responsibility for
8	Israel, through its military government, retained the	8	security for the purpose[s] of protecting Israelis and
9	necessary legislative, judicial and executive powers?	9	confronting the threat of terrorism."
10	A. Yes, it's meaning to say that they continued to be	10	Right?
11	occupying forces, except from the places that	11	A. Mm-hmm. Yeah.
12	transferred yeah.	12	Q. So and then
13	Q. Okay. And, this paragraph 4	13	A. This is in Area B, yeah.
14	A. Yes.	14	Q. And then, if you look at Article XII, just a little
15	Q indicates, particularly in the context of the	15	higher up
16	continuing jurisdiction well, let me let's look at	16	A. Yeah.
17	this, too, now. Okay, let's look at annex 4	17	Q second sentence of paragraph 1:
18	A. Yeah.	18	"Israel shall continue to carry the responsibility
19	Q just so we have it in mind	19	for defense against external threats" and then
20	A. Okay.	20	there's some language which I'm skipping, and then it
21	Q. Which is the next document. And annex 4, we need to	21	says:
22	look at. It's a little bit roundabout; you know how	22	" as well as the responsibility for overall
23	these documents sometimes are.	23	security of Israelis and Settlements"
24	So we have we have article 1, "Criminal	24	A. Mm-hmm.
25	Jurisdiction"; are you there?	25	Q. Right?
	Page 138		Page 140
1	A. Yes.	1	A. Mm-hmm.
2	Q. And then the section 2:	2	Q. "and will have all the powers to take the steps
3	"Israel has sole criminal jurisdiction over the	3	necessary to meet this responsibility"?
4	following offenses"	4	A. Mm-hmm.
5	A. Yeah.	5	Q. Right?
6	Q. "Offenses committed outside the Territory"; right?	6	A. Mm-hmm yes.
7	A. The territory is referred to	7	Q. Okay. So this is just what we're doing now is we're
8	Q. Is under 1.a. It's just right up above	8	just looking at the language that you and I discussed
9	A. Okay. Ah, yes, yes.	9	earlier; right?
10	Q. And then, if you look at 1.c.	10	A. Right.
11	Do you have 1.c. before you?	11	Q. And so we see, by looking at the main agreement and
12	A. Article 1?	12	looking at annex 4, that the PA agreed that Israel would
13	Q. Article 1, section paragraph 1.c. Right on the very	13	continue to carry overall responsibility for confronting
14	first page.	14	security threats; right?
15	A. I have 1.a. Let's see; where	15	MR. SATIN: Objection, misstates the record.
16	Q. It's it's on the first page.	16	You can answer.
17	A. On the first ah, yes. So 1.a.c., you mean?	17	A. That they retained security for it, yeah.
18	Q. Yeah. 1.c.:	18	BY MR. YALOWITZ:
19	"Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph a.	19	Q. And and that they retained did I did we look at
20	the criminal jurisdiction of each side over offenses	20	the did we look at the part about did we look
21 22	committed in Area B shall be in accordance with the	21 22	at 17? We did; right?
23	provisions of paragraph 2.a of Article XIII of [the] Agreement."	23	Then they they were to retain in order to do that, they were to retain the necessary Israel was to
7. 3	AZICCHICH.	د ک	mai, mey were to retain the necessary israel was to
	9	24	retain the necessary legislative judicial and avacutive
24 25	Right? Are you with me?	24 25	retain the necessary legislative, judicial and executive powers and responsibilities; right?

2

5

18

21

4

Page 141

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And they were going to do that through the military
- 3 government; right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Okay. And that included the judicial arm of the
- 6 military government?
- 7 A. Yes. Mm-hmm.
- 8 Q. And this was something to which the PLO agreed?
- 9 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. 10
- 11 So I want to ask you also about --
- 12 A. But if you -- your question at first was articulated
- 13 that they accepted them as a legitimate body, and I'm
- 14 not sure it is related, this question, because they also
- 15 accepted that there are settlements. And, you know,
- 16 settlements are in violation of the law, the -- the way
- 17 that the military courts function are in violation.
- 18
- 19 Q. Have you ever heard people from the PA say that the
- 20 reason that they conducted the second Intifada was to
- 21 rid the Palestinian people of the military courts?
- 22 MR. SATIN: Objection, no foundation.
- 23 A. If I heard Palestinian Authority --
- 24 BY MR. YALOWITZ:
- 25 Q. Yeah.

Page 142

- A. -- you're saying? I don't know people -- no, I don't.
- 2 I don't.

1

- 3 Q. I never heard that either.
- 4 All right. Did -- are you aware that there are
- 5 defendants in the military courts who refuse to
- 6 cooperate with the proceedings of the court?
- 7 A. I personally haven't read any case like this.
- 8 Q. Have you ever heard of defendants in the military courts
- 9 who have said, "I refuse to recognize the legitimacy of 10 the court"?
- 11 A. I haven't read cases on this.
- 12 Q. I think I've asked you this before, and if I did,
- 13 I apologize; but let me just make sure I have it.
- 14 You're not expressing any opinion whatsoever about
- 15 the guilt or innocence of any of the 21 defendants;
- 16 right?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. "No" meaning I'm correct?
- 19 A. I'm not taking any position on this. I think the only
- 20 question that I was reviewing in my opinion were whether
- 21 this case has -- even not that the personal, as such,
- 22 but this case, as other cases, has received due process
- 23 and a decision by an independent and impartial court,
- 24 and my answer is no. So these 21 cases is other cases.
- 25 Q. I'm sorry, the 21 cases are what?

- 1 A. Were put on a trial within a court that did not comply
 - with the requirement of due process and impartiality and

Page 143

- 3 independency.
- 4 Q. Do you -- are you expressing an opinion on whether any
 - of the individual judges in the 21 cases exhibited bias
- 6 or partiality?
- 7 A. I don't know who were the judges, so I --
- 8 Q. So the answer is no?
- 9 A. Is no.
- 10 Q. Are you expressing any opinions about whether any of the
- 11 21 defendants was deprived of notice of the reasons for
- 12 their arrest?
- 13 A. I didn't read the -- I don't know whether they were
- 14 notified.
- 15 Q. So the answer is "no," you were --
- 16 A. No. I don't know whether they were notified.
- 17 Q. Are you expressing any opinion as to whether any of the
 - 21 defendants was deprived of their right to be informed
- 19 of the nature of the charges?
- 20 A. Again, I didn't follow the facts and the due process
 - personally, so -- on each personal -- personal case, so
- 22 I can't tell you.
- Q. You have no opinion on that? 23
- 24 A. No, I didn't read enough of the material to -- to know.
- 25 Q. Do you -- are you expressing any opinion on whether any

- 1 of the 21 was deprived of his or her right to be brought
 - 2 before a judge without undue delay?
 - 3 A. I mean, I'm repeating myself: No, I didn't read the --
 - I don't know after how many time they saw a judge, but
 - 5 this could be looked at. I don't know.
 - 6 Q. Are you -- "I don't know" meaning you have no opinion on
 - 7 that?
 - 8 A. Because don't know the facts, yeah.
 - 9 Q. Are you expressing any opinion on whether any of the
 - 10 21 were deprived of their right to have access to an
 - 11 attorney?
 - 12 A. On the specific case, again, I don't have the fact; I
 - 13 don't know where they meet for the first time the
 - 14 lawyer, whether it was after two days, eight days, or
 - 15 30 days. I don't know.
 - 16 O. So that would be a "no"?
 - 17 A. Yes. Yes.
 - 18 Q. Yes? "Yes," you're expressing no opinion; right?
 - A. Right. I don't know the facts. 19
 - 20 Q. Are you expressing any opinion on whether any of the
 - 21 21 were deprived of the presumption of innocence?
 - 22 A. If -- you know, if you linked it with the equality of 23
 - the arms, without knowing their specific facts and
 - 24 cases, what they did and how their trial was handle,
 - 25 I would tell you that without knowing specifically

	Page 145		Page 147
1	and generally, from the structure of the court	1	MR. HILL: We've got like 3 hours and 37 minutes on the
2	I can tell you that there is no equality of arms, in	2	record, so what will you pay?
3	general, in military court cases, especially because how	3	MR. YALOWITZ: Let's round up to 4.
4	the prosecution and the judges are very close to each	4	MR. HILL: 4? She'll read and sign.
5	other.	5	Off the record.
6	So in that sense, trials in general do not have	6	(2:38 p.m.)
7	equality of arms in military courts.	7	(Whereupon the deposition concluded.)
8	Q. Is is equality of arms the same thing as the	8	(
9	presumption of innocence?	9	
10	A. It's not the same thing as it's not directly the same	10	
11	thing, of course, but a way to to safeguard the	11	
12	presumption of innocence and to make it meaningful, not	12	
13	just to say "Yes, they are innocent until I prove the	13	
14	contrary."	14	
15	To make it meaningful, you need to provide, for	15	
16	example, equality of arms; you need to provide due	16	
17	process, et cetera, et cetera.	17	
18	(Reporter clarification.)	18	
19	WITNESS: "Due process."	19	
20	A. Otherwise, it is meaningful, the presumption of	20	
21	innocence it is nonmeaningful; is meaningless.	21	
22	Sorry. Meaningless.	22	
23	BY MR. YALOWITZ:	23	
24	Q. That's okay.	24	
25	A. I'm sorry. My English sometimes	25	
	Page 146		Page 148
1	Q. Are you expressing any opinion on whether any of the	1	CERTIFICATE OF DEPONENT
2	21 defenda was deprived a trial without undue delay?	2	
3	A. Again, this will require a look on the date when they	3	I, DR. SHARON WEILL, hereby certify that I have read the
4	started since their investigation. I have no idea.	4	foregoing pages of my deposition of testimony taken in these
5	Q. Are you expressing any opinion on whether any of the	5	proceedings on Friday, November 22, 2013, and, with the
6	21 defendants was compelled to testify against himself,	6	exception of the changes listed on the next page and/or
7	or to confess guilt?	7	corrections, if any, find them to be a true and accurate
8	A. I don't know if anyone was compelled; I I didn't read	8	transcription thereof.
9	their investigation.	9	
10	Q. Are you expressing any opinion on whether any of the 21	10	
11	was subjected to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment	11	
12	or torture?	12	
13	A. I have no position on this.	13	Signed:
14	MR. SATIN: Are you done?	14	Name: DR. SHARON WEILL
15	MR. YALOWITZ: Okay. I have no further questions.	15	Date:
16	MR. SATIN: We could have a few minutes? We may have a few.	16	
17	MR. YALOWITZ: Okay.	17	
18	MR. SATIN: Give us five minutes.	18	Signed and subscribed to before me
19	MR. YALOWITZ: Take as long as you need.	19	this day of, 2013.
20	(A break was taken.)	20	
21	MR. SATIN: We have no questions for Dr. Weill.	21	NOTARY PUBLIC
22	MR. YALOWITZ: Okay.	22	
23	Thank you so much, Dr. Weill, for coming in.	23	
24 25	WITNESS: Thank you. MR. YALOWITZ: We much appreciate it.	24 25	
	MIK YALUWILZ: We milch appreciate it	1 25	

	Page 149	
1	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER	
2		
3	I, FIONA FARSON, with TransPerfect Legal Solutions, hereby	
4	certify that the testimony of the witness Sharon Weill in	
5	the foregoing transcript, taken on Friday, November 22, 2013	
6	was recorded by me in machine shorthand and was thereafter	
7	transcribed by me; and that the foregoing transcript is a	
8	true and accurate verbatim record of the said testimony.	
9	and and accurate verbalish record of the said testimony.	
10	I further certify that I am not a relative, employee,	
11	counsel or financially involved with any of the parties to	
12	the within cause, nor am I an employee or relative of any	
13	counsel for the parties, nor am I in any way interested in	
14	the outcome of the within cause.	
15	die odeome of the within eduse.	
16		
17	Signed:	
18	FIONA FARSON	
19	Dated: Friday, November 22, 2013	
20	Duted. Tilday, two ember 22, 2013	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
ر بے		
	7 150	
	Page 150	
1	ERRATA	
1	ERRATA	
1 2 3 4	ERRATA Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL	
1 2 3	ERRATA Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6	ERRATA Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6	ERRATA Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ERRATA Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ERRATA Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	E R R A T A Deposition of DR. SHARON WEILL Page/Line No. Description Reason for change	

A	add	39:11,11 44:14,19	81:16 85:1	142:24 143:8,15
absolute	28:22 36:13 40:13	46:13 49:23 51:8	allow	answered
69:11	added	55:12 62:17 65:4	113:5 121:20	105:23
	36:16	67:17 70:23 71:2	allowing	anybody
absolutely 33:8 34:18 35:4	additional	71:5,11,18 73:25	110:3	119:24 131:19
	36:13 40:13 65:25	80:2 82:17,19	allows	anyway
35:20,24 36:17	67:6,17	92:25 93:5,18,19	48:9	44:18 68:2 104:25
38:21,25 68:23	address	93:23,24 94:9	aloud	110:13 115:9
70:5 71:6,7,10,15	22:19 85:19	98:15 99:24	99:7	118:20 131:11
73:14 79:23 80:12	addressed	106:25 107:1	alternatives	apartheid
81:1 107:12	58:11 63:1	110:4 111:10	116:1	66:19 81:24 85:22
academic	addressing	122:12 128:22	ambiguous	95:1
16:16 71:25,25	56:23	131:17 133:12	92:4	apologize
accede	administrate	agreed	amend	88:24 102:23
67:13,14	22:23 53:18	59:25 82:11	37:24 40:12	142:13
accept	administration	121:14 122:16	amended	aporter
118:19 132:25	18:20 19:1 20:14	132:6,9 133:20	15:11	3:10,11
accepted	22:14 59:21	134:20 140:12	amnesty	appeal
54:3 56:23 104:19	administrative	141:8	73:11	53:21,22,24 54:2
133:2 141:13,15	52:13 59:8,13	agreeing	amount	58:23 99:17
accepting 133:21	admit	107:6 133:16	52:2	appeals
	25:18	agreement	anachronistic	53:25 54:3,5,11
access 16:9 52:23 53:1	admitted	40:4,6,11,14,15	115:5	78:5
56:15 144:10	5:17	40:21 41:3,12	analysis	appear
accession	adopted	50:18,25 51:5	68:17 72:15 91:3	6:9,14,20 36:9
67:6	89:9	60:3,14 114:25	analyze	appearing
accumulation	advanced	115:2 126:6 127:7		3:2,13
101:7	5:13	127:18 128:7,16	analyzing	appears
accurate	adversarial	129:15,22 130:6	91:3	37:16
148:7 149:8	74:6,12,16	130:13 131:2,11	annex	appellate
accused	advice	132:5 133:3,10,11	128:16,19,20	56:14
29:8,9 99:11	50:24 113:21	133:13,17,25	129:14 134:15	applicable
100:12	adviser	134:11,15,22	137:17,21 140:12	19:7 23:8,12
achieved	89:13 108:3	138:23 139:2	annexation	27:16 40:7,11,17
46:8,21	113:18 114:2	140:11	23:6	41:8,15 47:16
acronym	advisers	ah	annexed	48:25 62:13 65:8
57:5	113:25	33:6 43:8 45:5	45:14	87:6 88:22
act	advisory	60:19 74:8 82:24	answer	application
90:1 130:14,16	118:4,6	96:21 126:12	20:22,23 23:1,3	9:12 18:21 19:25
actions	advocating	135:12 138:9,17	24:8 26:3 31:23	38:2 49:22 87:10
46:12 56:17	106:9	ahead	55:2,16 56:3	applied
actor	affairs	40:10 88:24	59:10,12 68:6	61:7,17 62:3
65:21	84:11 135:10	al	72:11 77:7 90:2	65:12 83:25
actors	ago	1:5,13	92:6,21 93:18	113:16
65:10,12,14	67:10 127:15	alaqsa	94:4 104:4 105:1	applies
acts	agree	69:18 73:3,13	106:19,23 107:3	62:22 65:4 67:18
69:2 92:1	20:16 24:3 25:1	alia	109:1 122:6,8	apply
adaptation	29:10 34:1,20	79:1	125:5 129:9,12	27:22 50:16,19
81:10	35:3,9,15 37:1	alien	133:19 140:16	65:7,14 66:11
01.10				
Ī				

•				
67.22.24.69.10	l	59.22		11.7 60.25 77.16
67:22,24 68:19	army	58:22	avenue	11:7 68:25 77:16
84:23	62:11 81:16 85:1 arnold	aspects 58:11	3:6	basics 27:17 84:25
applying	2:8 3:5		avigdor 55:8	
84:21,23 94:19 115:14		assault 6:25	aviv	basis 18:11 45:12
	arrest 58:22 143:12	assess	5:22 6:1,4,8 8:6	121:10
appointed	arrested		, ,	
76:3,10,17,18,22 76:25 77:6	52:25 58:16	61:4 84:6 assistance	8:15,16 9:7,9 11:15 87:15,23	bay 121:5
appointing	arrived	130:17	88:5,6	bear
97:10	7:18	assume	aware	22:8 24:12 97:15
appointment	article	54:9 64:18 85:5	69:8,14 70:1,1,4	101:13 117:24
64:13,15,23 97:7	11:23 12:16,19	106:19,24 107:5	116:9 117:14	131:13
101:3,5 102:1,7,9	14:11,15,21,22	ľ	128:23 129:2,10	beginning
101.3,3 102.1,7,9	16:5 17:18 18:17	assumes 70:9 89:23	128.23 129.2,10	41:25 76:7 77:7
102.12,10,19	19:3,9,10 20:1,7,8		129.10 142.4	80:10
103.12,21 104.10	20:8,24,24 21:5	assumption 83:17 84:13	B	begins
· ·	20:8,24,24 21.3		bachelor	84:3 95:2,6
appointments 17:5	· ·	astonishing 28:24	5:9	84:3 93:2,0 behavior
· · ·	24:4,14,19 33:8 33:10 34:17 35:8		back	50:2
appreciate 112:9 146:25		attack 68:22 69:7	81:7 87:18 100:17	believe
	35:18 36:17,21		114:18 139:2	8:24 12:18 31:16
apprehended 123:4 126:19	37:17,18 39:17	attacking	backdrop	
	47:25 48:1,6 49:4	70:7,16	50:3	44:3 60:18 67:4,4
appropriate 20:16 27:7 126:23	63:3 66:6,13	attacks	background	67:8,10 76:1
	79:13,20 80:4	70:3,25	30:22	106:19,24 118:3
approval 125:19	84:8 87:7 92:19	attended	bad	belligerent 62:12
	94:20 97:9,16,18	15:6,8 attention	21:16 112:17	- '
area 127:20 136:23,24	98:21,23,24 99:10 110:4,25 113:5	32:19,25 34:10,22	balance	better 32:11 47:15 51:11
138:21 139:13	110:4,23 113:3	101:19 117:21,24	75:24 94:10	65:16 87:3 115:13
	114:10,18,21	124:14 134:21	balanced	115:15
areas 128:3 135:19	121:17 135:1		94:6	
		attorney 144:11	bank	beyond 24:19 86:24 94:9
arguing 106:25 110:25	137:24 138:12,13 138:22 139:1,3,5	authorities	17:6 22:5 25:3,8	bhill
	138.22 139.1,3,3	21:5 24:17 100:15	25:10 27:23 30:17	3:22
argument 63:9 95:17,19	articles	authority	39:21 40:5 59:6	bias
96:19 111:23	11:19 23:19	23:21,23 24:24	62:5,19 64:3	143:5
119:24 120:4	articulated	25:24 26:9 28:9	70:15,24 82:21	bibliography
123:11,15	68:9 141:12	41:1,2 67:5 86:25	83:5 85:16,22	16:22
arguments	asked	97:18,22 98:18	86:3,18 88:9	10.22 big
22:7 70:1 95:18	15:1,18 24:19	111:16,17 113:12	113:17 128:25	6:19 116:4
arm	33:10 85:10	115:4,11 127:25	bar	bilateral
4:9 11:23 14:1,11	105:23 125:13	135:19 136:5,17	5:17,23	50:25
14:16 141:5	126:9,11 142:12	141:23	barak	binding
armed	asking	authorized	68:8	42:8,13,14 116:23
65:20 66:12 68:4	54:4 68:3 89:25	18:20	bargain	118:12,14 119:5
68:16	104:2,5,20 106:14	authors	53:19 60:13	binds
arms	104.2,3,20 100.14	65:15,15	based	41:12
144:23 145:2,7,8	107:7,21 116:3	available	7:12 14:25 79:19	41.12 bit
145:16	aspect	16:16,20	basic	24:1 36:4 42:5
173.10	aspect	10.10,20		27.1 JU.T 72.J
	I	I	I	I

				Page .
105 0 105 00	l	1	Ι,	l
135:2 137:22	144:1	16:6,7,8 27:10	chance	citation
bodies	bullet	29:7 51:3,5,21	29:17 33:9 34:14	46:19 112:3 117:2
132:16 133:22	40:13	52:1,3,7,10 54:4	34:25 35:13 36:24	124:13
body	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$	54:10 55:11 58:5	change	cite
113:16 116:19	call	58:10,19,20 59:4	35:16 102:12,12	66:6
141:13	6:12 17:8 46:2	59:14 61:20 62:15	, , ,	cited
bombings		63:11,13,16,19	108:18 113:20	118:24 119:1
70:2 73:3	49:3 50:20 51:15	82:13 89:19,20,21	150:3	citing
book	85:21 88:8 118:6	91:6 101:12	changed	68:11 125:18
12:6 13:6,11	119:2	105:25 106:15	102:10	citizens
born	called	107:11 108:9,11	changes	27:10 83:5,15,16
7:17	7:12 11:23 12:6	108:17 116:25	89:2 90:10 102:17	85:13 90:12
bottom	17:4 71:19 122:17	117:14 118:10	103:10 148:6	civil
135:10	127:20	119:1 142:11,22	chaos	6:4 11:1 43:1
bound	calls	142:24,24,25	115:11	83:23 116:20
65:22,24 66:22	26:2 31:21 55:1	143:5 144:24	chapter	118:18
68:2 86:5 126:3	56:2 66:23 105:16	145:3	12:6 135:10,12	civilian
branch	129:7 131:9 132:2	cassese	charge	6:3,6,7 25:7,9,11
10:20,21 103:5	133:4 136:12	68:11	78:3,3,17	25:12 27:9,13,22
branches	captures	casualties	charged	27:24 28:4,5,6,13
23:9 110:6	38:15	69:15	58:2	28:15,24 58:4
breach	car	category	charges	68:20 69:4,8,20
99:9	82:4	46:14	143:19	71:3 81:9 82:3
break	care	cause	chartered	83:11,16 84:24
19:11 42:2 49:17	51:15	149:12,14	3:16	87:1,3,3 92:14
49:17,18 73:22	carry	central	check	122:3 123:12
123:25 124:7,9	129:23 139:18	103:22 104:11	8:24 49:13 54:19	civilians
126:10 146:20	140:13	centralize	75:24	68:21 69:7,15,17
brian	cars	24:18	checked	70:3,8,16,25 71:6
3:14	82:5	centralizes	108:15	80:4 81:15,17,22
briefly	case	24:5,15	checking	92:1 109:11 110:1
25:20 29:22 126:5	1:8 15:15 25:15	centre	61:12	111:8,9 116:10,16
briefs	29:3,6 30:10	2:9	chevalier	120:1
119:19 120:3	42:19 45:19,21	certain	3:16	civilized
bring	57:5,11,12,19,22	48:2,6 106:22	chief	120:15
46:19 63:19 85:22	59:9 61:11,11	118:9	78:2	clarification
114:19 115:19	62:24 67:15 68:9	certainly	children	38:8 60:8 75:18
brings	82:7 87:7 90:1	20:14 41:12	81:17 111:22	115:1 145:18
77:24	99:9 103:16 116:9	certificate	chooses	clash
broad	116:13 117:11	148:1 149:1	52:17 53:4,4	110:5,7,8
2:10 46:20	118:7 119:15,18	certify	112:24	class
broader	119:19,24 121:4	148:3 149:4,10	chronologic	8:8,15 9:2,4,4,6,9
62:1,2 84:7	121:25 122:17,18	cetera	17:12	9:17,18,19
broadly	122:20,22 123:2	72:1 77:14 85:25	circle	classes
60:10	124:16 126:17	108:23 145:17,17	139:3	8:1 17:11
brought	142:7,21,22	chalizhut	circumstance	classified
63:21 85:21 86:21	143:21 144:12	7:12	11:8 49:1 126:24	66:14
100:12 112:14	cases	challenged	circumstances	clause
125:20,23 126:13	6:19,19,21 7:1,1	18:15	46:9 93:4,16	48:3,7,20
			,	
		•	•	•

clear	committed	concerns	17:22 63:2 84:14	control
65:14 90:9	82:21 138:6,21	112:18	91:10 94:15 97:12	83:19 132:20
close	committee	concluded	99:13 101:1,9	controversial
7:14 145:4	57:6 102:19	147:7	120:12,20 121:8	130:11
cogens	116:17,18,19,22	condition	121:14,18 122:9	convention
45:22 46:6,9,13	117:8,16,18,19	59:14 61:13 99:16	constitutes	10:15,15 11:2,3,4
46:22 65:4,16	118:3,5,8,11,20	133:2	125:21	18:21,23 19:3
collection	119:1	conditions	constitution	20:1 21:2,10 23:7
17:4	committing	132:25	41:11	24:15 31:1,19,20
colonialization	69:8	conduct	constitutional	31:25 32:7 35:22
85:20 88:19	communication	15:9 22:17,18	46:4	38:1,2 42:11,12
colonization	116:22 118:7,19	62:4,19 63:12	constructed	42:13,20,21,22,23
66:19	compare	conducted	96:3	42:24,25 44:20
com	46:3	105:4 141:20	contemplated	45:4,6 50:11,17
3:10,11,22,23	compared	conference	39:17	61:8,14,18,25
combatant	46:5 64:2	30:3	contending	62:14,20 63:3
71:2	compelled	confess	43:12	66:1 86:25 97:10
combatants	146:6,8	146:7	content	113:8,9 118:16,17
126:18	competency	confession	93:3,15,17 123:20	118:17,21
come	29:11 88:15 96:8	53:12,12,14	context	conventions
47:17 89:21	competent	confirms	72:21 93:23	10:18,25 11:3
coming	27:15 77:23 92:9	99:19	111:17 116:25	42:8 109:10
5:8 146:23	103:14 104:16	conflict	123:19 125:7,21	conversation
commander	complete	23:3,25 47:11,17	126:13 127:3	15:19 30:18 42:1
17:6 24:22 28:8	122:6	65:12,21 66:12,14	137:15	convicted
28:14 30:24 35:16	completed	66:14,16,20 67:23	continuation	53:3 103:9,23
64:17 76:4,10,16	17:16	68:3,4,16 69:23	133:1	104:12 105:22
76:19,23,25 80:9	compliance	71:12	continue	106:2 107:14
89:8 97:11,22	30:20	conflicts	5:24 23:2 37:7	114:12
99:21 100:1,5	complicated	39:16	100:16 125:1	convictions
102:20	17:13 114:7	confronting	126:2 128:3	25:16 105:15
commenced	comply	129:17 139:9	129:23 132:10,12	
60:18,20	30:25 31:19,25	140:13	133:13,17,21	142:6
comment	46:6 89:3 109:12	confusion	136:11 139:18	сору
117:23 118:5	115:6 143:1	28:18	140:13	14:4,5,11 99:5
commentary	compound	connect	continued	copying
35:21 100:17	24:7 31:21 65:6	51:10	132:20 137:10	35:8
comments	67:19 94:3 113:2	connection	continuing	core
118:2,24	131:24 136:12	15:7	137:6,16	29:10 88:14
commesed	concentrate	consider	contours	103:22 104:11
60:19,19	8:21	43:4 55:8	128:24	correct
commission	concept	consistent	contradiction	10:7 19:6,8,10
116:20 117:6	21:15 43:25 47:4	43:17	80:7	20:6 34:7 43:18
121:15 125:24	conception	conspiracy	contrary	43:19 71:6 104:17
commit	93:3,14	125:21	145:14	122:10 142:18
80:22 81:4 83:5	concerned	constitute	contrast	corrections
83:10 92:7	132:14	91:4,17 92:13	28:13 64:2	148:7
commits	concerning	107:23 126:12	contravention	correctly
92:1,17	58:14	constituted	79:20	109:14

				Page 1
council	78:8,9 80:5,10,14	91:4 92:10 94:14	criminals	37:10 148:19
135:20,21 136:18	80:19,20 81:5,18	97:17,17,18 98:18	107:14	
136:20	81:22 82:2,10	99:14,16,17,22,25	criticism	days 52:22 58:17
counsel	84:15 85:12,16	100:4,13,13,22	34:3 83:10,12,14	144:14,14,15
25:24 26:6,8	86:23 87:2,3,4,5,8	100.4,13,13,22	84:1 100:23 101:3	de
52:17,18 75:12	87:20 88:1,14	104:13 105:19	102:4	33:23 81:5 82:19
149:11,13	90:12,17 91:5,10	104.13 103.19	criticized	82:23,23,25
count	91:12,17,18 92:3	110:14 112:18	121:19	dealing
52:4	92:9,18,20 96:10	113:5 115:24,25	cruel	21:12 58:11 62:10
countries	96:10 97:12,20	116:2,11 117:1	146:11	63:13 84:8 127:12
74:14	98:17,22 100:2	131:7,16 133:1,15	crystallized	deals
country	102:6 103:5	134:20 136:10	42:17	45:6 96:3
44:16,17 99:17	102.6 103.3	141:17,21 142:5,8		dealt
44.10,17 99.17 course	104.10,10 103.7	141.17,21 142.3,8	cure 81:3,7,23,23 82:1	8:16 56:10
9:13 11:14 16:15	110:2 111:7,9	covenant	82:2 84:16 85:18	debate
23:9 24:24 30:15	,	11:1 43:1 116:20		82:11
32:24 41:14,14	112:24,25 113:1 114:13,19 115:13		86:17 87:14,16,24 87:25 90:23	december
53:8 65:21 66:2	114:13,19 115:13	cover 9:14	87:25 90:23 105:11 107:22	12:17
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			decide
66:15 69:16,24	116:23 117:6,8	create 32:8 87:19	108:3 115:23	50:16
71:1 72:1,21 73:1	118:25 119:7,10		cured	
73:20 74:8,10,12	120:1,21,21,23	created	91:15,20	decided
79:1 86:10 108:9	121:8,13 122:2,3	24:20,23 49:1	curious 22:12	58:21 59:5 62:24
108:20 127:15,16	122:9 123:12,13	80:17 88:19 103:3	· ·	103:17
135:23 145:11	123:15,17 125:1	118:21	currently	decision
courses	126:13 128:24	creating	8:3	11:5 84:4 107:24
8:7	129:2,12 134:7,13	86:20	custom	116:15,17 117:16
court	142:6,10,23 143:1	creation	44:18 45:5	118:6,8,12,13,14
1:1 6:3,3,4,9,9,14	145:1,3 149:1	113:5 127:22 crime	customary	118:23 119:3
6:15,15,17 8:17	courtesies		42:16,18 43:5,6	120:6,8 142:23
9:12 11:17,21	41:25	29:9 46:19 69:20	43:16 45:9,17	decisions
12:15 13:9 15:6	courtesy	69:22,24 80:23	68:1,19,23 74:1,5	116:24 119:9
15:15 18:2,12	125:13	92:7,18 121:20	74:9,18,20 76:5	120:3,5
22:15,23 23:22	courts	125:22,22	76:11,13,24 112:7	declares
25:9,11 27:9,14	8:2,8,20 9:23 11:5	crimes	112:8 119:2	48:21
27:15,22 28:2,4,5	12:9 13:7,8 15:5	25:8,16 29:8	120:10,12	dedicated
28:6,7,25,25 31:7	17:21 20:15,17	46:18 58:2,2 69:9	cycle	9:22
31:8 32:8 39:13 39:16 40:18 41:16	22:4,18 24:20,23	69:18 81:4 82:20	58:24	default 102:11
	25:7 28:14,15,15 29:3,11 30:19,25	83:5,11 87:9		
45:16,16 53:19,23 53:24 54:2,10	31:2,18 51:20	88:15 103:10,23 104:12 111:25	daniel	defenda 146:2
/	52:16 53:3 54:1		4:11 29:15	defendant
55:18 56:10,14,18		133:15 137:7	data	
56:19,19,20,23,24	57:2 58:3,12 61:8	criminal	72:17	52:17,19 53:20
58:6,10,18,21	61:22 62:20,25	6:1,4,7 27:9,10	date	54:3 defendants
59:5,19,21 60:11	63:2,10,17,20	55:10 58:24 59:9	13:14 37:13 146:3	
60:17,17 61:7,17	64:3,5,14,16	68:24 77:24 80:25	148:15	1:15 3:13 27:4
61:24 62:3 63:1	79:18 80:24,25	91:6 103:16 105:6	dated	29:17 82:12
63:22 64:8,8,12	81:20 82:20 83:7	127:12 128:15	149:19	123:11 142:5,8,15
64:19,20,20,25	83:11,16,17,18	129:19 137:24	day	143:11,18 146:6
68:18 73:25 78:4	84:3,5,6,14 88:12	138:3,20	uay	defense
	_	_		l

				1490
16:11 139:19	90:9,10 112:22	124:14	83:19	18:25 130:15
defined	114:17	directed	donald	efficient
23:7	describing	82:14	4:12	130:14
degrading	19:25 90:24 102:7	directing	dozen	effort
146:11	description	117:21,24 134:21	59:17	30:25 31:18,25
degree	4:7 20:6 150:3	directionally	dr	32:3
5:10,11,13,15	deserves	52:5,6	1:18 2:2 4:2 5:2,6	eight
125:2	103:19	directly	146:21,23 148:3	7:17,18 58:17
delay	designated	85:20 145:10	148:14 150:2,24	144:14
144:2 146:2	67:5	disagree	draft	either
deliver	designed	32:22 33:2,17	21:1	62:25 123:21
60:1	23:1 81:9 84:23	92:25 107:1,2	drafted	142:3
demanding	detail	disagreeing	21:10 115:7	elaborate
63:15	24:1	107:6	drafting	89:12
department	detained	discuss	21:2 109:10	elaboration
7:11 41:2	52:24	27:11 30:11	drugs	49:22,24,25
depending	detainees	discussed	82:4	elect
77:18	121:7	80:10 110:12	dual	74:24
depends	detention	126:5 140:8	88:20	elected
40:15 51:1 55:17	58:14,23 59:8,13	discussing	due	74:20,23 75:9
58:5 65:13 69:23	59:15 61:13	16:11 101:25	8:19 9:25 27:17	77:10
69:23 72:12	detentions	124:22	63:13 74:9,11	election
deponent	52:13	discussion	81:17 82:9,12,13	74:24 75:1,7
148:1	developed	49:16 63:23	83:20 92:7,12,24	77:19
deposition	109:9 113:8	disengagement	93:2,14,17,17,24	elections
1:18 2:2 5:2 14:9	developing	64:4	103:13,14,20,22	74:25
14:10 147:7 148:4	113:10	disregarded	104:12 105:8	elevation
150:2	difference	111:1	108:2 115:15,17	78:4,7
deprived	82:1	distinction	118:15 120:13	email
143:11,18 144:1	different	68:25 109:16	142:22 143:2,20	3:10,22
144:10,21 146:2	8:9 9:15,20,21,21	distortion	145:16,19	emerged
derived	10:19,20,21 11:5	81:14	duration	42:16
102:6	30:21 45:2 47:10	district	31:12	emergency
deriving	47:22 55:7 58:19	1:1,2 6:4,9,15	duty	48:12,22 49:6,12
64:16	64:9,10,14 69:24	divided	126:3	114:20 115:10
derogate	70:22 79:18 80:24	103:3		employee
46:10 48:24	80:25,25 84:12,12	division	E	149:10,12
derogated	86:10,12,13 87:9	6:2	earlier	enacted
51:5	88:23 96:10,11	document	126:5 133:24	64:17,21
derogation	119:7	132:11 137:21	140:9	encounter
47:20 48:3,7,9,20	differently	documents	easy	58:24
49:3 51:11	89:22	137:23	44:19	encounters
describe	difficult	doing	ec2n	59:6
21:14 39:21	15:12 61:4 108:22	44:4 57:17 63:17	2:11	endorse
133:14	din	101:11 110:9	editing	37:18 38:14 40:18
described	31:5	115:12 140:7	34:5 35:25 36:2	enemy
9:3 11:14 20:5	direct	domestic	effect	126:17
22:13 79:2 88:7	32:19,25 34:10,22	40:16 46:5 122:14	20:8,11 137:6	enforce
89:2,10,20,22	35:7 101:19	domination	effective	40:17

				Page '
	l			
enforcement	54:2 62:18 64:21	37:23 40:17,25	existence	72:19 81:8,19
21:6 24:17,24	80:12 81:25 86:6	45:15 47:12,25	128:24 129:11	83:10 85:15 96:9
english	86:8 92:22 97:21	48:16 50:6,7,21	133:20	102:5 106:6
145:25	98:18 100:4 105:3	50:22 57:3 58:13	existing	121:13 144:12
enlarged	116:19	63:12 65:11 70:14		facto
111:16	establishing	74:5 100:8 112:6	132:13	33:23 81:5
ensure	27:22,25 79:18	117:15 120:10	exists	factors
75:22 77:8 130:14	establishment	121:19 132:19	113:13	79:19 114:8
ensuring	18:12 111:7	134:3 145:16	expand	facts
18:25	estimate	exceed	82:3 87:4	25:21 70:9 72:5,7
entered	58:20	86:23	expanding	72:17,18 89:23
45:9 123:9	et	excellent	87:8,11	103:17 121:4
entering	1:5,13 72:1 77:14	28:20 34:9 51:13	expected	143:20 144:8,19
131:14	85:25 108:23	72:9	21:10	144:23
enters	145:17,17	exception	experience	failure
91:24	european	111:8,15 148:6	56:22	71:12
entire	11:4 117:6,8	exceptions	expert	fair
53:16 58:24 66:6	evaluating	48:1	4:8,11 30:5 32:14	18:9 23:25 26:1
86:2,3,12 95:8	62:18	exciting	35:5 64:7,10	29:4,5 31:1 32:2
111:22	evidence	13:15	105:18	38:11,16 42:14
entities	70:9 80:6 89:24	exclude	explain	43:10 46:8 48:14
133:16	121:23	87:12	22:11 45:23	54:8,21 58:9
entitled	evident	excluded	explicit	59:23 60:7 72:13
50:1 52:18,19	15:10	86:14	86:24	84:5 92:18 104:23
53:8,20 82:9,12	evidential	excuse	expressing	104:24 105:3,13
equal	45:12	70:2 71:8	142:14 143:4,10	112:20 114:11,13
111:19	evolved	execution	143:17,25 144:9	120:22
equality	65:9	21:7 77:21	144:18,20 146:1,5	fairly
81:2 144:22 145:2	exact	executive	146:10	38:15 79:22 88:16
145:7,8,16	50:17 51:22 52:2	24:6 78:2 128:6	expression	fairness
especially	62:17 80:23,23	136:1 137:9	133:25	36:14
101:7 145:3	120:16 134:7	140:24	extend	fall
esq	exactly	exercise	100:18	46:13
3:3,4,14,15	11:9 18:4,24	33:22 44:17 83:18	extending	familiar
essence	20:12 34:17 35:2	exhibit	25:2	65:25 67:12 71:18
49:1 94:8	35:10 47:19 49:11	4:7,8,9,11,12,13	extensive	73:2 113:24
establish	51:16 53:11 64:15	4:14 14:9,10	44:12,15	122:20 127:10
23:21,24 25:7,9	67:21 68:10 80:1	32:16 124:10,15	extent	family
28:2 31:4 41:5	84:7 89:9 95:16	exhibited	49:5 93:25 94:1	7:18
50:1 77:9 80:9	96:25 109:11	143:5	external	famous
85:7 92:20 97:18	112:12 117:5	exhibits	139:19	57:21,22,22
98:22 99:21,25	118:1 122:8 123:6	14:13 134:16	extraterritorial	far
102:18 112:24	125:6 136:14	exigenc	87:10	13:11 18:16
115:11	exam	37:25	eye	farson
established	5:23	exist	13:20	1:24 149:3,18
18:5,6,7,9 24:22	examination	38:20 129:13		fault
27:8 28:7,15,24	4:2 5:4	existed	<u> </u>	89:1
30:20,24 31:3,7	example	103:22 104:11	fact	favor
31:14 39:12,17	9:17 23:6 25:15	128:25 131:8,17	25:1 33:19,25	60:12,12

fax	67:20 79:12 85:19	122.12	56.20 77.11 01.5	07.10.100.10
3:9,21	86:17,22 91:6	132:13 formed	56:20 77:11 91:5	97:10 109:10
· /	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	43:21	93:25 113:14,15 141:17	113:8,9
feel	94:19 95:19 96:3			genocide
106:22	97:6,19 102:14	former	functioning	46:23,24
feeling	104:6 111:16	110:10	81:21	german
35:17,23	138:14,16,17	forms	functions	122:22,23
feels	141:12 144:13	46:12	132:7	getting
35:17 36:3,4	fit	forth	further	62:16
feldman	27:2 50:23 81:13	22:18	89:12 133:17	give
55:8	five	found	146:15 149:10	14:4 30:5 53:12
felt	146:18	120:21,23 125:1	G	58:20 59:4 114:11
125:13 126:3	fixed	foundation		114:13 116:23
field	93:3,15,17	55:15 69:19 70:10	galleys	118:8 134:8,10
10:16,22 71:21	flip	89:23 105:16,24	13:15	146:18
fifteenth	139:2	106:4,11 107:15	gather	given
3:17	fluently	107:20 108:8,14	29:22 72:22	33:9
fight	43:24 93:7	108:19 133:18	gaza	gives
68:15	focus	141:22	59:6 62:5,20 64:3	23:21,23
figure	20:13 30:18	fourth	gazette	giving
51:22	101:14	10:14,15 18:22	17:7,14,17	78:14
filed	focusing	19:3 20:1 24:14	gbd	go
54:5 60:21,22	64:11	31:1,18,20 32:7	1:9	40:10 72:25 73:19
files	follow	42:20 44:20 45:4	general	75:1 81:7 87:18
6:13 25:17,25	43:21 44:1 59:3	45:6 61:7,17	13:8 43:16 47:6	97:5 100:17
26:23,25 29:7	143:20	62:13 63:3 97:10	47:18,20 48:17	111:24 114:18
105:21	followed	framed	49:22 50:3,20	124:5,18 133:11
financial	43:17	111:15	51:18 55:18 73:8	goes
2:9	following	france	76:18 85:3 87:2	74:23
financially	79:17 121:1 138:4	7:17 74:14	109:22 111:8	going
149:11	footnote	frankly	117:22 118:2,24	12:16 13:6 14:15
find	16:19,20 19:18,20	•	120:8,15 145:3,6	24:12 37:9 48:24
15:12 17:9 148:7		free	generally	50:18 92:24 94:24
fine	117:12,22	105:6	22:22 38:3,4,11	106:23 128:20
35:1 36:19,25	forbidden	french	48:25 65:7,8	141:2
39:3 56:8 79:25	25:2,4,6	7:19,20 21:14,16	73:17 87:1 94:6	good
finish	force	21:16,18,20,21	107:21 109:12	5:6,7 13:25 30:16
38:10 57:17	23:12 24:23	31:24 51:24 64:19	110:1 127:18	55:21,22 70:20
102:22	132:24	frequently	145:1	83:20 89:5 114:9
finished	forced	15:12	generate	119:18 124:4
34:15 37:21 126:7	53:12		111:21	125:1 135:7
54:13 57:21 120:7		friday	geneva	
	forces	1:19 5:1 148:5	8:12 10:14,14	gordon
1:24 10:13 149:3	127:19 137:11	149:5,19	14:23 18:23 19:3	15:16,17
149:18	foregoing	friend	20:1 21:10 23:7	govern
first 5.10.14.15.6.15	148:4 149:5,7	30:6	24:15 30:6 31:1	21:11 50:2 81:9
5:10,14,15 6:15	foreign	fulfill	31:18,20,25 32:7	84:24.85:2
9:3 11:13 17:21	112:24	128:6	35:21 42:20 61:8	governing
24:19 30:22 39:7	form	full		21:8 22:14 114:9
43:7 45:6,25	45:20 47:20 60:14	9:4	61:13,25 62:14,20	government
53:23 62:12 66:11	73:25 119:2	function	63:3 66:1 86:25	24:5,15,16,18
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

_:	 	l		l
56:16 128:3,11,14	hamdan	58:21 59:5,19	121:11,15	23:14
132:6 135:18,25	82:10 119:11	60:10,17 61:7,17	hundred	imagine
136:16 137:8	120:18 121:4,4,7	62:3,25 63:22	51:23	16:7 89:6 129:4
141:3,6	121:14 122:2	68:17 118:25	hundreds	130:4
governmental	123:17 124:13,16	119:7	54:13,14,15,16,17	immediate
93:25	125:1,18 126:7	higher	59:23 61:1 101:12	130:14
governs	127:3	78:9 139:15	hypothetical	impartial
66:9	hand	highly	78:15 79:3 88:8	74:22 75:15,21,25
grant	64:4 87:11,12	54:25 55:13	88:18,21 89:6,11	76:14 92:9,11
23:21 97:18	99:11 109:17,18	hill	89:12	96:4 109:13
granted	114:16	3:14 13:1 26:17	hypothetically	115:14 142:23
97:22 115:4	handle	26:19,20,22,23,23	91:20	impartiality
great	31:8,14 144:24	147:1,4		76:20 91:7 95:18
51:2 83:22	handling	hired		95:20,21 96:7
group	130:15	26:8,18,21	iccpr	97:6 104:18
63:8 96:11	hands	hold	48:1,6,10 79:13	109:23 143:2
groups	24:16	132:20	icj	important
79:18	happened	holds	45:16 51:3	53:15 68:13 74:11
grow	61:21 80:11	116:9	iconic 57.2 12 10 20	80:16 89:25 90:6
7:16	happens	hope	57:3,12,19,20 icrc	90:7 96:5 119:15
gss	60:5	37:10 136:14	45:17 112:8	119:16 122:14
7:2 57:23,25	happy	hostilities	idea	125:11 126:1
guantanamo	11:25	63:12	51:17 100:17	importantly
121:5	harm	hours	108:15,20 111:14	108:21
guaranteed	94:8	8:21 147:1	112:17 121:19	impose
75:14	head	hrl	122:1 146:4	83:20
guaranteeing	61:21 126:1	10:1	identification	imposed
105:13	hear	huge	14:13 32:16	94:1
guess	70:14 76:6	52:2	124:10 134:16	impossible
110:24 130:7	heard	human	identified	28:8 77:4 135:14
guilt	29:25 70:12	7:11,12 8:19 9:24	43:7	imprisonment
107:11 142:15	141:19,23 142:3,8	10:19,23 11:6,8	identifying	58:23
146:7	hearing 15:8	42:21,22,22 54:22 55:8,10 63:8	44:18 84:17	improper 92:17 122:2 125:3
guilty 90:2 103:18,18,18		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	idf	
103:19 105:5	hearings 15:6	65:13 71:19,22	7:8	inasmuch 38:22
105:19 105:5	heart	72:1 73:2,8,10 93:22 94:6,10	ihl	incident
H	106:24 117:17	109:9,17,24,25	8:19 9:24 10:1,1	130:15
hague	130:20	111:21 112:3,16	10:16 22:22,22	incited
10:15 33:8 35:1	help	111.21 112.3,10	27:7 65:10,20	73:12
44:20 45:4,6,13	6:13	113.7,10,13	69:1 81:8 84:23	include
45:14 61:17,19,24			85:24 110:3 111:6	40:4 41:22 46:14
62:3,13,21	helpful 5:16 37:20 39:14	116:9,12,15,17,18	112:23 113:5,13	52:13 59:15 65:10
haifa	50:9	116:18 117:5,6,7	122:13	included
7:13	hierarchy	117:8,16 118:3,4 118:8,10,20,25	ii	40:12 128:15
half	45:24	118.8,10,20,23	95:6,16	136:22 141:5
5:14	45:24 high	humanitarian	illegal	includes
hamdam	9:12 45:15 56:18	10:2 22:13 23:1	70:15 111:21	56:14
4:12	56:19,20,22 58:10	71:11 109:18	illegality	including
	30.17,40,44 30.10	/1.11 107.10		meruumg
			l	l

	1	•	1	1
79:19 81:17	inquisitory	interrupt	56:24 62:4 64:9	76:10,13,22 77:5
111:22 121:11	74:12,14	40:10 95:25	68:17 70:3,7,25	77:21 78:4,10,11
independence	insofar	intervention	80:15,20 81:22	89:25 102:16
91:7 95:20,21	132:14	18:19 19:24	83:5,7,15,15,21	104:21 108:12
96:7 97:6 111:23	instance	intifada	89:7 90:11 116:5	115:18 144:2,4
112:2,18	6:15 53:23,23	69:18 73:4,13	127:19 128:2,24	judged
independency	intended	141:20	130:1 135:25	103:14
76:20 77:2,25	60:4 67:3	investigated	136:16	judges
78:24 79:5 104:18	intent	53:10	israelis	6:10 27:12 72:1
105:14 109:23	66:21 83:24	investigation	81:4 82:19 83:10	74:20,22,24 75:1
110:14 143:3	intention	146:4,9	84:4 85:23 88:11	75:1,2,15,20
independent	30:25	investigations	129:16,24,25	76:16 77:8,17,23
27:16 74:22 75:15	intentionally	57:23,25	130:2 135:21	77:25 78:20,21
75:20,25 76:14	69:7	invoked	139:8,23	90:6 100:7 103:1
77:5,8,11,14,17	inter	44:13	israels	103:8 104:17
87:2 90:1,7 92:9	78:25	involve	129:20	143:5,7 145:4
92:11 96:4 104:21	interested	115:15	issue	judging
105:7 109:13	68:7 149:13	involved	8:18 17:12 31:9	25:12
115:14,18 142:23	interesting	149:11	33:22 59:8,12	judgment
indicated	72:4 86:5 118:23	involving	63:11,14,20,21	27:21 60:1
66:21	interests	130:15	64:11 74:11 76:20	judicial
indicates	129:20	islands	77:12,12,15 96:23	4:9 11:23 14:1,11
137:15	interim	88:22	111:6 114:23,24	14:16 20:14 21:6
indictment	40:4 41:3,12	israel	116:18 120:18	24:5 58:25 73:17
63:16	126:6 127:7,18	5:20 6:12 7:16	122:8	127:22,25 128:6
individual	128:7,16 129:14	18:15 20:16 25:1	issued	128:14 132:7
29:15 56:21 68:21	129:22 130:5,13	25:7,9 27:8,10,25	34:2 76:16	136:1 137:9
77:13 78:17,18	131:10 132:5	28:2,16 30:17,23	issues	140:24 141:5
143:5	133:2 134:10,14	42:19 52:17,23,25	22:6 69:24 74:9	judiciary
individuals	international	53:3 54:23 55:22	82:5 85:19 90:23	24:17 109:13
106:9 107:19	2:9 10:2,25 11:3,6	56:10,14 57:6	item	jure
130:1	22:13,25 23:10,16	58:5 61:8 62:18	82:15	82:19,23,23,25
influenced	33:3 40:6,11,14	63:9 64:5 67:20		juris
119:6	40:21 42:6 43:1,5	67:20 73:7 83:6	J	44:5,7,9
information	43:16 45:9,16,19	83:12,16,21 85:8	jail	jurisdiction
72:22,23 73:14	45:20 47:6,6,10	85:11,13 88:19	115:21	15:4 56:13,15,16
informed	51:4 65:7,9 66:12	91:25 92:5 113:19	jewish	80:8,13,18,19,24
143:18	66:14,16,20 68:4	114:4 128:5,10	83:15	81:22 82:4 86:3
inhuman	68:16 71:11 78:23	129:15,19,22	join	86:14,15,16,24
146:11	79:3 81:2 89:3	131:2 132:5,6,19	50:22	87:5,8,10,20
innocence	92:10 108:2	135:18 137:8	joint	88:14 90:16 91:13
107:11 142:15	109:17 110:8	138:3 139:7,18	16:17	113:14 127:13
144:21 145:9,12	119:6,25 121:11	140:12,23	jordanian	128:15 129:19,25
145:21	121:15 132:22	israeli	86:19	130:1 135:15,20
innocent	134:1 136:3	5:17 8:1,17 9:12	journals	137:16,25 138:3
105:5 106:10	interpreted	9:16,23 11:17,21	71:25	138:20
145:13	113:10	12:9,14 13:7	judge	jurists
inquisitorial	interrogation	18:11 22:4 27:22	15:16 55:18 58:17	70:4
74:7	52:21,24 53:17	30:24 45:15 51:19	74:23 75:3,9 76:3	jury

74:17,17,19 82:22	3:3,10	109:3,4 110:16	23:1,10,10,16	lecture
jus	kept	113:24 114:1,24	24:23 27:16,23	8:21,23 9:2,15
45:22 46:6,9,13	15:24	115:8,21 116:5,6	33:3,24 35:16	11:14 29:25
46:21 65:4,16	killing	116:13 120:2	37:25 38:20 39:19	lectures
just	9:18 68:9 69:20	122:14 129:11,13	40:4,22 41:8 42:6	9:22
7:21 10:1 16:24	kills	130:24 131:10,14	43:4,5,16,22 44:2	left
19:14 20:13 21:15	69:21	132:19,23 133:5,5	44:4,4,20 45:9,19	120:14
21:25 24:13 25:19	kind	133:6 137:22	45:20 46:3 47:6,6	legal
28:22 34:13,23	6:13 28:25 81:14	141:15 142:1	47:10,11,17,21	10:22 25:2 40:16
35:19 36:14 37:12	81:24 83:19 84:12	143:7,13,16,24	49:22,24,25 50:11	41:5,5 43:18
42:2 49:9 66:7,25	85:16 87:11	144:4,5,6,8,13,15	50:17 51:4 52:20	68:17 70:4,17,17
76:6 79:2 82:17	107:19 110:5,5	144:19,22 146:8	52:20 55:10 62:13	70:23 71:8,23,23
87:18 88:7 89:10	114:20 115:25	knowing	64:6,9,11,21,25	71:24 72:15 83:3
91:20 93:11 96:2	kinds	144:23,25	65:7,8,9,24 71:12	84:12 86:18,21
98:19,19 99:3,6	9:14	knowledge	77:23,24 79:4	87:19 88:8,20
101:14 102:22	knesset	62:24	81:2,8,13,14	89:13,22 93:2
104:24 105:12	89:8	known	84:23 85:3,23,24	100:19 108:3,12
106:17,23,25	know	96:24 131:20,23	85:24 86:4,19,19	113:18,25 114:2
107:6,25 114:6,8	8:13 9:19 15:11	132:1,3	86:19,21 87:7,10	129:11 130:17
115:20 116:3	16:7 17:10,12	kvechver	88:18,22,23 89:3	132:11 133:22
117:21,24 124:14	18:2,8,11,16	30:4	89:3,4 90:12	135:10 136:15
124:19 125:13	19:15 25:15,20,21		92:10 100:24	149:3
126:3 130:1	27:19 29:9,19	L	101:1 105:6 109:9	legality
131:13 134:12,19	30:9,12,17 32:3	lack	109:17,18,24,25	12:7 22:4,19
134:21 136:24	34:13,18,23 35:17	55:15 69:19 70:9	110:6,9 111:18,21	23:20 84:6
137:19 138:8	35:18 36:24 37:20	89:23 95:21 96:5	112:3,8,8,17	legislate
139:3,14 140:7,8	37:22 38:7 39:18	96:6 105:16,23	113:7,10,15,16	37:24
142:13 145:13	40:9 42:2,3 44:17	106:4,11 107:15	114:16 115:6,14	legislating
justice	49:4,13 51:18	107:20 108:8,14	116:10,12,15,24	24:22
9:12 18:20 19:1	52:2,4,5 53:11	108:19 133:18	119:2,2,6,25	legislation
45:16,17 56:18,19	54:6,17,20 55:16	landmark	120:10,12 121:11	9:18 15:10,13,14
56:20,23 58:11,21	55:19,19 56:3,4	57:20	121:16 122:14	20:14 21:6 23:22
59:5,7,20,21	57:5 58:13,17	language	125:1 132:22	23:24 41:15 46:5
60:11,17 61:7,17	59:22 60:5,24,24	98:23 139:20	136:3 141:16	46:6 86:12,13
62:3 63:1,22 68:8	60:25 61:5 62:8	140:8	laws	87:6
68:18 91:6 118:25	63:4 64:9,13,15	larger	10:17 37:24 38:24	legislative
119:8	64:19,23 66:24	23:4	40:17,19 42:18	24:5,16 28:9
justification	67:14,20 70:11,12	lasts	45:7 68:2 71:13	128:5 136:1 137:9
70:16 71:8 115:16	70:18,18 71:24	21:24	71:14 96:22,24	140:24
115:17,18	72:2,3,12,19 73:1	latin	114:10	legitimacy
justify	73:6,10,15 74:25	44:7	lawyer	142:9
70:2,7,24	75:17,23 77:13,23	law	6:11 16:11 52:19	legitimate
	82:3,6 87:22	5:9,10,15,20,21	52:21,22,25 53:5	74:13 132:16,22
<u>K</u>	92:13 101:6	5:21 6:5 8:13	53:7,13,16,16,18	133:22 141:13
keep	103:16 104:23,25	9:11 10:2,5,19,20	55:9,10,14 56:1	level
13:20 87:8	105:11 106:5,12	10:21,23 11:7	144:14	11:4
keeps	107:24,24 108:4,9	15:15 17:10 18:11	lawyers	lex
136:17	108:11,13,17,20	18:15 19:7 20:25	29:16 53:1 54:22	47:7,14 48:16
kent	108:21,22,22	21:11,13 22:13	55:21,22	49:1,3,21 51:9,10

_				Page 12
51.11 110.11	26.21.27.12.20.5		60.2 10 61.4	20.22.24.25
51:11 110:11	36:21 37:12 39:5	mangle 21:15	60:3,19 61:4	29:22,24,25
liberation	39:24 49:14 60:24 67:25 72:6,23	· -	62:14 64:8 68:25	michael 3:15 55:25
1:12 66:18	79:11 84:7 97:23	manuals	69:12,13,21 72:11	
library		31:19 32:8	72:11,12 74:13	middle
17:10	99:1 114:6 117:3	march	75:9 82:5 84:15	108:18 114:21,22
light	123:23 135:9	13:13	86:8 89:16 91:16	milchev
113:10,15	137:16,17,22	marco	94:10 100:6,24	3:22,23
limited	138:10 139:3,14	14:24	102:14 110:16	military
86:24 88:14 94:24	140:19,20,20	mareva	112:10 115:23	6:3 8:1,8,13,17,20
limiting	146:3	61:11	116:1,8 120:3,18	9:11,23 11:17,21
111:24	looked	mark	125:20,23 129:6	12:9,15 13:7,9
line	15:14 144:5	1:5 14:8,9,10	130:9,17 131:18	15:5,6,15 17:5,8
150:3	looking	32:14 134:14	133:10 138:17	17:21 20:15,17,25
link	18:17 77:15 84:2	marked	144:3	21:13 22:4,15,23
105:25	96:5 135:12 140:8	14:13 32:16	meaning	23:22,24 24:4,15
linked	140:11,12	124:10 134:16	28:6 63:3 84:8	24:18,21 27:13
12:18 85:20	lord	martial	137:10 142:18	28:8,13,14,14
144:22	5:9	64:7,8,19,20 65:1	144:6	29:11 30:19,24,24
listed	lost	103:5	meaningful	31:2,7 32:8 33:5
148:6	135:2	master	145:12,15,20	39:13,16 41:16
litigating	lot	14:22	meaningless	51:19 52:16 53:3
119:5	16:18 30:10 44:16	material	145:21,22	53:19,22,24,25
little	62:15 119:21,22	16:16,25 143:24	means	54:2,10 56:24
42:5 137:22	119:23	materials	46:5 57:20 67:23	57:2 58:3,6,12
139:14	lots	99:4	79:17 81:20 87:12	59:7,21 60:17
lived	113:20	matter	113:8	61:8,22,24 62:4
7:14	lower	11:10 82:19,22	meant	62:19,25 63:2,10
living	78:8	83:3,15 112:16	28:5 119:22	63:20 64:3,4,6,11
80:17 85:25	lucy	matters	mechanism	64:12,16,16,17,18
llp	3:4,11 21:19	6:7,22 31:14	75:16,17,19,21	64:20,22 76:3,10
2:8 3:5	lunch	51:17 56:11 62:18	meet	76:15,16,18,19,23
local	123:25 124:7,9,12	136:22	53:13,15,16 140:3	76:25 77:1 80:5,9
18:19 37:24 38:20		maturing	144:13	80:9 81:5,8,16
38:24 40:18,18,18	M	63:19	meeting	82:2,20 83:7,17
73:9,9 86:19	machine	mayor	52:20	83:24 84:3 85:24
london	149:6	75:8	members	86:4,6,7,9,10,11
2:11	magistrate	mcmillan	100:13	86:23 87:4,5,8,20
long	6:17	3:4,11 21:20	memory	88:1,12,14 89:7
18:6,7,8,9 22:1	main	mean	118:9 125:15	90:12,17 91:5
58:16 59:2 67:10	10:17,22 134:21	6:24 8:9 9:7	mention	92:3,14,18,20
98:5 101:10	139:2 140:11	16:24 18:2 19:9	8:13 16:19	94:14 97:11,17,20
102:15 127:15	maintain	21:9,23 22:16	mentioned	97:21,22 99:13,21
146:19	77:16	25:11 27:24 28:3	17:4,19 35:5 56:9	99:22 100:1,4,12
longer	major	29:24 32:4 35:18	86:20 98:20	100:14,14,22
52:22	114:23	37:22 40:10,20,24	merely	102:6,19 103:4,10
longterm	majority	43:24 44:16 47:24	43:25	104:13,20 105:18
113:15	120:23 121:13	49:24 51:2 52:6	merits	107:22 109:11,22
look	making	53:5 54:6,20 56:4	58:21 59:5	110:2,14 111:7,9
14:3 25:20 36:21	104:22 109:16,20	56:7 58:15 59:24	met	111:18 112:18,24
L				

				rage 13
112:25 113:5	99:15 101:15	necessary	46:2,7	notwithstanding
114:19 116:2,10	107:4 109:19,19	128:5 136:1 137:9	nonindependent	138:19
116:16 117:1	109:19 122:19,25	140:3,23,24	115:19	november
120:1,20 121:8,15	123:3,10,14 126:4	necessitate	noninternational	1:19 2:3 5:1
122:2,22,23 123:5	127:1 128:17	37:25	65:11	148:5 149:5,19
123:13 126:25	131:3 139:11,24	necessity	nonmeaningful	nuance
127:19 128:2,10	140:1,4,6 141:7	18:25 94:2,7,9	145:21	53:6,10
128:14,24 129:2	model	need	nonmilitary	number
129:12 131:7,16	31:18	8:18,24 13:24	27:10 28:15	14:10 15:14 16:20
132:6 133:1,15	modulate	33:21,22,24 34:1	nonpolitical	43:22 44:1 51:21
134:7,12,20	81:12	35:24 40:18 41:5	27:15 97:13 99:13	62:17 68:12 88:12
135:18,25 136:10	modulating	44:16,16 49:13	101:2,9 104:19	88:13 121:10,16
137:8 141:2,6,17	81:13	60:24 64:25 67:25	nonstate	135:3,12
141:21 142:5,8	modulation	72:21 74:22 75:14	65:10,12,14,21	numbers
145:3,7	81:11	75:16 76:13 77:18	nonwar	54:9 61:15,16
miller	moment	86:2,17 97:13	11:10	95:14
3:16	8:3 34:13 39:7	115:11,20 116:1,4	norm	ny
mind	97:24	116:6 117:2	42:16 43:21 46:8	3:7
73:19 95:13	month	118:19 123:22	47:12,16 65:18	
137:19	101:11	124:5 125:6 127:4	68:20,24,24 69:2	0
mine	morning	130:24 132:25	74:1,5,18 76:5,11	obey
30:6	5:6,7	137:21 145:15,16	76:13,24 110:8,10	114:5,6
minimum	msatin	146:19	110:11	obeyed
103:6	3:23	needed	normally	113:25
minister	murder	31:8 87:16	51:2 67:22 87:9	object
89:8	69:20,22	needs	normcreating	68:22
minor		35:22 94:7,7,7,10	42:11,12 43:5	objected
6:16,18	N	negotiate	44:11 45:21	121:10
minute	name	132:24	norms	objection
97:15	84:10 148:14	negotiation	45:22 47:17,17	20:18,21 24:7
minutes	150:24	131:15 132:19,23	74:9,20 78:23	26:2 31:21 55:1
146:16,18 147:1	named	negotiations	110:7 114:17	55:15 56:2 65:6
misstates	29:15	133:6,10	134:1	66:23 67:19 69:19
80:6 140:15	narrow	negotiators	north	70:9 74:2 75:12
mistake	20:13	128:23	51:3	80:6 89:23 92:4
88:6	nation	never	notary	94:3 105:16,23
mistaken	113:18	63:4,6,7 64:7 70:5	148:21	106:4,11 107:15
33:19	national	73:14 142:3	noted	107:20 108:8,14
mmhmm	13:8 46:3 49:6,10	new	17:18 117:7	108:19 113:2
10:6,8 11:11,20	49:10 66:9,18	1:2 3:7 37:24	notes	125:3 129:7 131:9
17:20 20:2 22:2	79:19	ngos	15:18,25	131:21,24 132:2
26:12 27:6 29:14	nationality	73:7,9	notice	133:4,18 136:12
32:21 33:14 34:12	91:14 96:12	nods	143:11	140:15 141:22
36:10,12 37:2	nature	44:22 90:13	noticed	objective
39:1,6,20,23 45:8	92:4 143:19	nominating	17:4	36:7
46:1 47:5,8 50:13	navy	78:4,19	notified	obligation
50:13 59:1 60:9	7:13,13	nonacquirement	143:14,16	31:4,5 43:18 49:4
72:16 78:16 79:16	necessarily	23:11	notorious	50:3 65:13 71:14
85:9 94:16 98:2	16:9 81:13	nonderogable	82:6,7 131:18	71:16 74:19 75:20
	1		1	•

97:19	6:1 7:13,15	once	33:21 34:2 86:6,7	148:4
obligations	officers	33:20 34:2 70:12	86:9,10,11	palestine
50:2 69:11 128:7	122:22	99:6 131:25	organ	1:12 73:7
137:7	offices	ones	118:21	palestinian
obliged	2:8	31:7 47:1 94:18	organic	25:24 26:8 27:5
99:23	official	oneshot	41:1,4	41:2 53:1 70:6
observer	17:7,14	18:1	organization	80:14,18 127:25
136:16	oh	open	1:13 56:21 71:19	141:21,23
observing	14:22 44:7 117:4	98:23 120:14	86:9	palestinians
105:13 107:25	135:2	131:18	orient	25:8,16 85:24
obsolete	okay	opening	124:19	86:11 88:11
110:25	7:21 8:5 10:14	62:14	origin	paragraph
occupation	11:12 19:12,13	operate	79:20	19:21 32:20,22
4:9 8:14 9:11,16	20:13 24:12 26:6	31:11	original	33:1,1,10,13,17
9:17 11:15,24	26:16,23 27:4,7	operates	56:15	34:3,6,11,22 35:3
14:2,12,16 20:25	28:10,12,17,17,20	56:25	outcome	35:7,9,11,13 36:1
21:1,2,13 22:15	29:2,6 30:16 34:9	opinion	149:14	36:21 37:1,8,12
22:20,24 23:2,15	36:4 38:1,3,20	27:8 30:5 35:5	outcomes	37:16 38:19 39:5
23:20 24:14 30:19	39:4,14 41:4 42:2	36:2 44:5,7 45:10	60:16	39:8 68:12,14
33:23 56:11 62:12	42:4 43:3,8,9,10	56:1 68:7,8 69:17	outside	98:6,7 99:10
64:12 66:19 68:14	43:13,15 46:4	81:3 91:1,2,9,24	138:6	100:10 111:3
68:15 81:8,16,19	50:11 51:12,14,15	94:14 101:6 103:9	outstanding	117:14 123:22
84:18,19,22 86:4	51:17 55:24 56:9	104:10 105:18	13:18 34:21	135:17 137:13
86:19 111:19	59:4,10 62:23	107:2,10,13,18	overall	138:13,22 139:17
112:23 113:16	63:25 70:21 72:18	108:6 118:6	129:23 130:2	paragraphs
114:7,22,23,24	79:7 82:24 83:3	121:25 124:20	136:24,24 139:22	37:19 68:13 98:8
115:3	84:21,25 85:14	125:2,14 142:14	140:13	98:15
occupations	88:7,25 89:13,14	142:20 143:4,17	overriding	paris
39:16	89:17 90:23 91:1	143:23,25 144:6,9	129:15 139:7	8:11
occupied	91:19,22 92:23	144:18,20 146:1,5		park
28:3,9 62:11	93:2 95:1,9 97:3	146:10	P	3:6
76:15 80:5,7,16	98:9 101:23 102:9		pa	part
81:5 99:16,18	104:3 106:2 107:5	26:1 118:4 119:3	65:5 67:18 73:12	6:8 8:13 9:2,24
100:19	107:9 111:11	143:10	127:8,22 128:12	11:13 15:24 31:6
occupying	117:13 121:20,25	optional	132:14 140:12	32:10 65:21 87:23
18:19 33:24 92:19	124:1 125:12,16	9:13	141:19	90:25 91:1,1,1
98:22 99:11	126:2,3 127:3,5,5	order	page	94:17,25 95:6,22
132:24 136:6,17	127:6,7 130:8	15:9,11 17:13	4:2,7 18:18 32:18	96:3,7,9,13
137:11	134:10 135:2	18:13,14 21:7,7	39:21,24 79:9	101:14 102:5
offenses	137:13,17,20	24:21 33:22 44:11	90:25 95:6,7	124:19 140:20
6:16,18 92:20	138:9 140:7 141:5	58:14 60:12,12	96:14 97:25 98:6	partiality
129:20 138:4,6,20	141:10 145:24	64:17,22,23 75:3	98:7 101:21,23	143:6
offensive	146:15,17,22	76:15 77:8,16	109:5,8 117:10,11	particular
120:22,23	old	81:13 84:6 85:18	117:25 124:18,22	38:18 49:23 50:19
offer	2:10 7:17	86:17 104:16	134:23 135:3,4,11	51:5,6 61:11
96:19	older	110:8 137:6	138:14,16 139:5	102:6 106:6
offering	47:13	140:22	148:6 150:3	particularly
107:10,13,18	omit	orders	pages	137:15
office	38:19,20 39:13	17:5,8,12 33:5,20	96:19 98:1 114:17	parties
			-	-

				Page 1:
41 10 40 14 50 1	J	,	""	47 10 110 10
41:12 42:14 50:1	perspective	plo	possible	47:12 110:10
50:5,5,16 51:6	55:13	26:11 65:5 66:21	93:6 111:20 114:9	-
67:24 133:24	petition	67:4,18 68:3	117:20	35:20,24 36:17
149:11,13	60:10 63:4,6,7,15	73:12 85:8 127:8	power	38:21,25
party	63:18,19	128:23 129:2	9:18 18:19 85:7	prevention
67:20 71:12,13	petitioner	131:2,7 132:5,14	92:19 97:10 98:22	137:2
118:15,19,22	60:12	132:21 133:2,16	99:11 136:6,17	primary
119:5 120:11	petitions	141:8	powers	69:3
passages	56:16,21,23 59:18	point	24:6,16,18 79:1	prime
13:9	60:16 62:10	40:13 53:7,16	85:10 96:6 128:6	89:8
pause	photocopies	59:25 81:2 91:3,6	128:11,14 135:20	principal
42:1	134:9	91:7,9,15 97:7	136:2,19 137:9	124:20
pay	phrase	100:20 101:7	140:2,25	principle
12:1,2 13:24	21:14 134:7	103:19 109:20	practice	68:25
147:2	picati	110:13,23,24	5:20 43:17 44:1,2	prism
peace	57:5	111:5 115:9,23	44:12 51:4 54:23	97:14
40:14,21 85:7	pictet	pointed	83:14 120:9	prison
penal	100:8,8,9,10	82:18	practiced	103:11,24 104:1
99:9	picture	points	5:23	104:14,24 105:5
pending	84:7	101:5,8	precatory	107:14
58:16	piracy	police	118:13	prisoners
people	46:14	41:2	preemptory	57:25
29:7 52:25 69:7	place	policy	45:22 68:20	probably
70:18 71:21 79:19	36:5 80:23 86:1	83:15 84:4,9,10	prefer	33:9 41:23 55:19
80:13,17,22 85:25	93:4,15 103:8,11	89:4,5	73:9	69:14 130:4
103:9,13,23	placed	political	preferably	problem
104:12,24 105:4,5	124:15	11:1 22:20 43:1	99:17	27:22 35:2 72:18
105:12,21 106:2	placement	83:18 84:15 91:11	premise	74:16 77:25 80:13
115:21 131:25	100:21	91:18 92:2 96:10	88:3	80:21 81:3,7
141:19,21 142:1	places	114:25 115:2	premised	84:17,21 105:8
peremptory	30:19 36:9,11	116:21 118:18	71:16	110:14
69:2	53:1 88:23 137:11	politicians	prepare	problematic
perfect	plaintiffs	70:7	29:16	77:19,22,24 78:5
135:7	1:6 3:2	population	prepublication	78:21
period	plan	69:4 81:9 83:19	13:11	problems
115:3	89:9,9	84:25 85:2 86:1	presence	47:11 52:23
permitted	planning	111:22	80:15	procedural
46:9 99:21	114:5	populations	present	104:17
person	plea	68:21 84:13	121:21	procedure
25:12 53:2,2	53:19 60:13	porter	presenting	81:1 96:5 102:3
77:13 91:14,24	plead	2:8 3:5	59:19	102:13 105:4
92:7,17 121:20	53:20	position	press	procedures
personal	please	105:2,12 106:7	16:17 72:24,25	103:12 104:10
142:21 143:21,21	28:23 32:18 36:21	107:12,16 111:4	presumption	proceedings
personally	37:6 40:10 42:7	142:19 146:13	144:21 145:9,12	142:6 148:5
29:20,21 30:9	83:2 96:1 102:23	positions	145:20	process
142:7 143:21	102:23 122:7	110:9	pretty	8:20 9:25 22:14
personnel	pleasure	possibility	57:18	22:16,16 27:17
122:24	113:24	97:20 116:21	prevail	63:14 73:17 74:9
			=	
L	1	•	1	1

				Page 1
74:12,12 81:17	proposal	128:2 129:22	8:19 15:3,4 22:20	R
82:9,12,13 83:20	116:5	130:13	23:2 24:7 27:12	raised
85:20 92:8,12,24	propose	provides	27:14 30:22 31:22	63:8 76:19 120:4
93:2,14,17,17,24	91:15	24:1 48:1	31:24 33:10,25	ramallah
97:7,13 101:3,4	proposition	provision	35:17 38:10,23	27:9
102:7,9 103:13,15	84:22	23:5 44:11,13	40:20 44:15,15,24	rape
103:20,21,23	prosecute	48:25 50:23,24	55:7,21,23 57:1	6:20 7:1
104:12,15 105:9	87:15 92:20	64:20 66:17 67:21	58:25 59:2 60:4,7	ratification
108:1,2 115:15,17	114:10	67:25 110:3	60:10 61:15 62:1	42:9 132:13,15
118:20 120:13	prosecuted	113:13 115:5	63:7,19 65:6 67:3	ratify
142:22 143:2,20	51:21 58:3 82:6,8	130:5,21 134:12	67:19 68:5,6,7	42:14 67:24
145:17,19	83:11,16,21 87:2	provisions	69:13 70:20,22	reach
proclamation	87:3 88:1	42:12 43:5 44:20	73:15 76:19 78:10	50:18 109:22
18:13,14 24:21	prosecuting	45:21 48:10 50:17	82:14,18 83:23,24	133:25
33:6 34:18	91:12	99:9 127:12	88:20,21 89:18,19	reached
proclamations	prosecution	138:19,22	90:3,5,8,8 91:16	43:23 133:17
17:5	58:23 59:9,9,13	public	92:8 93:22 94:3	read
professional	77:20 82:16,20	23:10,16 47:10	104:6 105:14	11:23,25 12:6
92:11	83:7 103:6,7	48:12,21 49:12	106:17 107:5,16	15:14 16:4,5,6,7,8
professor	145:4	55:18 57:5 148:21	116:4 125:9,17,24	16:15 19:8,13,23
30:4 68:11 71:25	prosecutions	publication	126:10,23 130:25	21:19 25:17,18
professors	51:19 52:14 58:12	12:11 14:25 16:18	131:1,24 132:18	28:21 29:6,17,18
116:24	prosecutor	33:4,20 34:6	136:12 141:12,14	30:13,15 31:5
prohibited	6:1,13,19,24	publications	142:20	32:4,9 33:7,9,10
69:4 71:6	16:12 76:17,18	17:1	questionable	33:13,16 34:16
prohibits	77:1 78:3,18	publicity	40:24	36:6 37:19 39:8,9
109:10 116:10,16	102:17 103:1	96:23	questioning	43:24 49:21 51:22
119:25	prosecutors	publish	66:13	52:3,13 54:10,14
promise	78:18	13:6 33:21 34:1	questions	54:15,15 64:25
37:11,11	protecting	published	14:2 23:4 59:19	67:4 70:5,6 73:8,9
promote	11:7 20:15 129:16	11:19 12:13,16	73:16 82:13 94:13	73:10,10,11 87:7
78:10	139:8	13:13,20 14:19	94:24 97:4 106:23	92:24 93:6,7,8,10
promotion	protects	96:24 108:23	106:25 107:7	98:3,7,11 99:6,7
77:18 78:8,8	85:12	punish	146:15,21	100:16 106:15
promulgated	protocol	114:12	quirin	108:9 109:14
99:9	65:25 66:4,11,11	purchase	122:18 123:11,17	111:3 112:4,11
proofs	66:17,22 67:6,17	13:21	124:13,14,23	119:10,19,23
13:16,17	67:18,21,22,23,24	purpose	125:1,7,18,20	120:3 123:22
properly	68:19 120:10	69:3 129:16 139:8	126:11,13,15,17	125:6 127:4,12,14
63:2 84:14 91:4	135:6,6	purposes	126:23	127:14,15,16
91:10,17 94:15	prove	27:2 92:2 112:25	quite	134:6 136:15
97:12 99:13 101:1	145:13	132:8	7:14 15:11,12	139:1 142:7,11
101:8 107:23	provide	put	16:17 29:22 52:23	143:13,24 144:3
121:17 122:9	23:22 91:6 107:23	41:20 70:2 81:21	127:14	146:8 147:4 148:3
126:12	112:3 115:13	87:14 96:8 104:24	quote	reading
proportion	145:15,16	115:21 143:1	79:24 117:19	16:13 37:21 73:5
69:14	provided	0	quoted	130:5 134:6
proportionality	86:25 87:21 96:11	question	79:12 100:10	real
69:13	105:21 111:18	question		35:22 59:20

				Page 17
108:23	90.2 114.14 15	nogouding	133:14	76:6 120:24 121:2
	80:3 114:14,15	regarding		
really	record	74:9	relative	repeated 8:23
6:18 22:20,25	13:1 49:16 63:23	regime 86:22 89:22 90:11	149:10,12	
23:1 25:18 27:18	140:15 147:2,5		released	repeating 144:3
30:18 37:17 39:11 45:19 51:15 55:3	149:8 recorded	region 17:6	103:11,24 104:1 104:14 107:14	· =
	149:6	* * *	relevance	rephrase 74:3
82:14 104:21		regional 11:4	relevance 42:24	
111:24 114:12	redeployment 127:19			report
125:8 135:14	· · ·	regular	relevant	4:8,11 14:5,9
reason	reducing	81:18 91:13	15:13,13 25:25	16:17 27:2 29:13
31:2 141:20 150:3	87:12	regulate	43:20,22 61:24	29:16,17 30:14
reasonable	ref	114:24	134:19	31:6 32:9,10,15
71:21	1:25	regulates	reliable	32:19 34:11 39:22
reasons	refer	22:17,18	72:20 108:7	39:25 40:12 72:6
18:20 20:15	20:24 119:8 120:9	regulation	relied	73:3 79:9 82:16
121:16 143:11	120:10	24:2 33:8 35:1	122:17 123:17	83:13 84:2 90:24
recall	reference	45:13,14 61:19,24	125:2	94:18,20 97:23
25:21 32:9 122:18	19:20	62:13 130:19	relieve	101:17,20,21,22
123:1,6,19 125:8	referenced	regulations	71:13	102:5 109:6
125:20 126:6,9,17	117:18 118:2	62:4,21	rely	112:16 117:19
127:16,18 128:10	references	reinforce	71:22,23,24 72:12	119:13
128:18,20 129:14	117:17	83:17	125:7 126:11	reported
130:13,20	referred	reisner	relying	1:23 54:10 72:17
receive	10:5 61:13 120:8	4:11 29:15,19	19:2	reporter
72:24	120:15 134:7	32:6,15 34:11	remained	38:8 75:18 115:1
received	138:7	36:2 38:12	20:11	145:18 149:1
12:19,23 25:19	referring	reisners	remains	reports
26:25 142:22	18:22 41:15 45:14	32:18 97:23 98:15	73:1,1	16:23 71:22 72:19
reciprocally	66:13 91:2,8	100:10 101:17	remember	73:5,6,11
67:23	101:16 104:3	rejected	8:25 16:12 21:12	represent
reciprocity	reflect	123:15	30:8 32:10 49:9	53:7
71:16	33:7	relate	49:11 52:15 54:7	represents
recognize	reflected	112:2	70:12 81:10	42:16
142:9	120:13	related	103:25 106:6	reprisals
recognized	reflection	9:16 13:9 20:25	113:7 114:18	71:5
45:15 120:11	34:17	21:5 59:12,12	117:17,20 120:2,3	reputational
recognizes	reframing	63:11 65:20 102:5	120:16 122:4,5	55:13
85:15	12:7 22:3	123:22 141:14	123:19,21 125:25	request
recollection	refresh	relates	130:4 133:24	60:7
124:25 125:4	124:25 125:15	57:23	remind	requested
recommend	refreshing	relating	21:1	13:1
85:17 113:23	125:3	22:22,23 23:24	remitted	require
recommendation	refuse	56:11,16 58:11	123:5	33:20 98:21
76:17 77:1 102:17	142:5,9	59:5,20,20 60:17	render	108:23 146:3
recommendations	regard	61:22 62:19	83:12	required
114:15	55:20 94:14 97:6	129:20 130:25	repeal	33:3,4 39:13 49:5
recommends	137:7	relation	37:24 113:13	97:12 98:20 101:1
102:19	regarded	65:20 66:8	repeat	127:19,22 128:6
reconcile	54:25 55:13 56:4	relationship	24:9 37:17 66:25	requirement
				l

				Page 10
27.19.77.2.0		20.1 0 10 11 20	120.24 120.2 11	47.10.51.4.90.25
27:18 77:2,9	restricted 111:15	20:1,9,10,11,20	129:24 130:3,11	47:10 51:4 80:25 83:24 93:2 104:23
78:24 79:5 91:5		22:5,25 23:4,10	131:4,8,16,23	108:22 120:21
92:10 103:7	restricting 90:16	23:23 24:1,3,13	132:1,8 135:5,15	
109:12,23,25 143:2	restriction	25:3,6,8,13,17,22	136:4,7,20,21,22	rumsfeld 4:12
		26:10,11,13,24	137:4 138:6,8,13	
requirements	94:1,2	27:1,5 28:25	138:24 139:10,25	run 74.25.75.7.101.10
27:20 77:16 92:14	restrictive	29:22 30:13 32:14	140:5,9,10,14,21	74:25 75:7 101:10
93:24	94:9	33:13 34:5,19	140:25 141:3	running
requires	restricts	35:9 36:11,17,18	142:4,16 143:18	75:8
49:5 74:6 80:4	52:20	36:20 37:5 38:14	144:1,10,18,19	runs
97:10	results	38:18 39:15 41:6	rights	74:23 95:6
research	43:16	41:19,24 42:9,10	8:19 9:25 10:19	<u> </u>
14:21,25 15:2,3,4	resume	42:20 43:23 44:21	10:23 11:1,7,8	sadly
15:9,24 16:5	124:2	45:7,25 46:2	23:7 42:21,22,22	12:1
72:21	retain	47:15,21 48:6,7,8	43:1 48:4 50:2	safeguard
reservation	53:5 128:5 132:7	48:11,13,21 50:4	53:11 54:22 55:8	21:7 27:16 145:11
50:22 51:2	132:12 133:14	50:12 52:5,16,18	55:10 63:8 65:13	
reservations	136:1 140:22,23	53:5,9,21 54:21	71:19,22 72:1	safeguarded 78:25
50:20	140:24	56:6,8,11,13,15	73:2,8,10 93:22	
reserve	retained	57:10,14,19,23,25	94:6,10 109:9,17	sahin
50:24	29:15 128:15	58:3 60:14 61:6	109:24,25 111:21	117:9
residents	137:8 140:17,19	66:10 67:18 68:5	112:3,17 113:7,10	salim
27:5 59:6 80:14	retaliation	68:22 69:5,6,9,11	113:15 114:16	4:12
resolve	71:5	69:12,24 70:19,25	115:6 116:10,12	sarcasm
110:8	retrial	71:3,9,14,16	116:15,17,18,19	105:1
resolved	105:9 107:19	72:19,24 73:16	116:21 117:5,7,7	sassoli
23:3	retroactive	74:7,18,21 75:13	117:9,16 118:3,4	14:24
resource	97:1	76:5,12 81:18	118:8,11,18,20,25	satin
7:11	review	82:8,21 83:8,12	119:25 128:7	3:15 20:18,21
resources	35:11,13 36:24	84:25 86:7,15	137:6	24:7 26:2,16
7:12	37:6 38:7 122:13	87:1,25 89:15	rle	31:21 55:1,15
respect	reviewed	90:12,25 92:2,7	1:9	56:2 65:6 66:23
38:20,24 71:12,14	97:14 103:17	94:8,13 95:19	roman	67:19 69:19 70:9
respected	reviewing	96:24 100:8,21,23	95:15 135:12,14	74:2 75:12 80:6
77:16	58:14,15 142:20	100:25 101:20	round	89:23 92:4 94:3,5
responsibilities	rewriting	102:3,4,8,13	147:3	101:16 105:16,23
128:11 135:20	34:5	103:13,14,20	roundabout	106:4,11 107:15
136:2,19 140:25	rhetorical	105:15,21,22	137:22	107:20 108:8,14
responsibility	111:5	110:6 112:9,19	royalty	108:19 113:2
80:8 129:15,23	rid	113:4 115:17	12:3	124:4 125:3 129:7
130:2 136:25	141:21	116:7 119:3,11	rule	130:7 131:9,21,24
139:7,18,22 140:3	right	121:7,8,9,11,12	27:17 43:22 46:7	132:2 133:4,18
140:13	5:16 6:11 8:20	121:16,23,24	47:13,14,14 48:18	136:12 140:15
responsible	9:3,25 10:3,19	122:23 123:5,7,13	65:11 68:25 83:20	141:22 146:14,16
78:19	11:10,21 12:20,23	123:15,18 124:16	92:11 104:19,24	146:18,21
restrained	12:25 13:11,23	124:23 125:25	105:3 108:18	Saw 17.17.27.1.144.4
16:18,24	14:17 15:7,20	126:5 127:2,10,23	109:22 111:8	17:17 27:1 144:4
restrict	16:3 17:2,22 18:2	127:25 128:3,8,16	,	saying
87:21	18:9,10 19:4,7,8	128:19,22 129:1,5	rules	23:5 28:3,5 30:4
·				

31:8,15 35:19	6:22 90:21	79:18	149:6	smaller
38:2 66:17 68:14			show	14:22
70:4 100:11	see 15:23 16:21 19:18	separated 103:6	32:11,13 110:13	snuck
112:16 118:3	19:19,20 24:21		112:5 125:14	122:22 123:1
142:1	33:7 34:3 38:23	separately 101:7	12.3 123.14	sokolow
	41:17,19 63:14,18	separation	showing	1:5
says 48:24 62:12 66:4	79:13 80:7 94:8	77:20 79:1 96:6	83:14	soldiers
69:14 100:10	102:10 110:4	77:20 79:1 90:0 serious	83:14 shown	64:5
	114:21 117:15		91:11	sole
116:15 117:15 136:14 139:21		76:19 90:3,5 105:8	side	129:19 138:3
	119:7 120:4,4			
scope	121:23 124:19	served	138:20	solutions
111:24	130:22 135:9,14	7:8	sides	149:3
se	135:17 138:15	serving	60:3 130:14	solve
92:16,16	140:11	104:13	.136:10	47:11
sea 50 11 10 51 2	seeing	session	sign	somewhat
50:11,18 51:3	22:8,11 52:22	17:24	147:4	67:11
second	58:17	set	signatory	soon
19:21 22:9 43:4,6	seen	125:24 128:15	42:19,23	12:17 53:6
43:6 79:14 86:23	21:3 66:20 115:5	settlement	signed	sorry
91:3,9 94:23 96:9	segregated	132:21	41:13 148:13,18	8:4 10:10 15:1
99:10 102:25	84:9 86:21	settlements	149:17 150:23	16:15 17:7 19:16
111:17 117:3	segregation	25:5 28:25 63:12	similarly	26:4 28:18 40:9
139:5,17 141:20	95:3	70:15,24 86:5	23:12 35:21	44:6 45:3 49:8
secret	selection	132:9,20 139:23	simplicit	52:15 73:19 78:13
131:16	97:13	141:15,16	87:14	82:24 87:24 88:2
section	selfdetermination	settlers	simply	88:4,6 90:15 93:6
32:6,9 83:13 84:2	23:11 66:10	87:13	43:8 52:14 91:16	93:13 94:21 95:4
90:24,25 91:2	semester	sexual	115:20	95:25 96:17,21
94:17,20,21 95:8	9:4	6:25	single	98:5,6,13 106:5
95:13,18,20 138:2	send	sfard	78:17	110:18 112:4
138:13	13:2 116:21	55:25	sit	117:4 122:6
secure	sense	shamgar	45:25 99:16,17	124:13 126:7
104:18	41:9,10 43:17	31:6	sitting	134:9 135:1,5,13
security	44:13 51:10 53:25	share	31:6 56:18 64:3	142:25 145:22,25
18:21 20:13,15	59:4,18 84:14	43:23	81:5	sort
21:7 23:25 25:8	91:12,18 97:21	sharon	situation	10:16 11:6 18:1
25:16 29:8,9 31:8	100:16 107:7	1:18 2:2 4:2,8,10	21:3,3 33:23	41:25 43:3 58:24
31:14 38:2 49:10	114:20 115:10,13	5:2 30:5 148:3,14	37:25 49:23 50:19	62:16
57:25 81:4 83:6	121:22 132:15	149:4 150:2,24	78:5,15 79:2	sound
85:12 88:15 90:20	145:6	shaul	80:17,21,22 81:23	52:5 114:14 123:7
92:17,20 94:7	sent	15:16	81:24 82:2 85:18	123:13
111:25 112:25	12:25 13:17 26:23	shelf	87:17,25 102:16	sounds
114:9,23 129:16	105:25	17:10	105:11 107:22	112:13
129:20,24 130:2	sentence	shell	108:4 111:19,20	source
132:7 133:15	19:11,13,14,23	147:4	112:22 115:19,24	40:4,22 41:1,4,11
136:22,25 137:7	36:16 39:12 79:14	short	skipping	43:4 45:18 72:5,6
139:8,23 140:14	107:23 109:21	21:8 31:10,10,11	88:24 139:20	72:23,24 84:20
140:17	139:6,17	31:12 84:24	slavery	sources
securityrelated	separate	shorthand	46:16	10:22 39:19 42:5

				1496 2
112:14	spoke	44:1 74:24 75:5,7	subject	121:13 123:15,17
southern	15:16 35:19	118:14,15 119:10	22:3 56:10 74:1	124:25
1:2	spoken	119:17 122:23	74:18 82:20 83:7	sure
speak	21:16,20,21 31:24	123:1,9 126:18,19	88:11 90:12 99:25	8:10 14:6 19:16
6:10 7:19 23:16	51:24 64:19	statistic	107:19	22:10 24:12 27:24
23:19 30:8 44:23	spread	51:22 52:3,12,12	subjected	31:9 33:12 39:10
57:17 65:16 90:14	69:3	54:6	146:11	40:20 43:10 45:4
106:22,22	square	status	subjective	50:1 60:6 61:16
speaking	139:3	46:8 69:8 70:15	36:7	65:10 67:2,4
45:24 51:22 88:17	staffed	70:23,24 100:14	submit	68:12,18,23 69:21
88:18 114:19	27:9	statute	29:16 56:21	72:8 74:5 75:20
131:25 133:8	stagiaire	46:4	submitted	75:24,25 76:8
special	6:12	stealing	14:23 29:13 67:5	77:9 83:3 87:23
45:19,21 49:1	stand	82:5	subordinate	93:12 94:22 99:3
103:4 112:22	23:14 70:17,17	steps	85:1 100:14 103:2	103:21 104:9
120:20	standard	140:2	subparagraph	105:21 104.9
specialis	103:7 108:2	stipulated	138:19	120:24,25 121:3
47:7,14 48:16	stands	21:4	subscribed	125:11,23 127:9
49:2,3,21 51:9,10	10:2	stop	148:18	129:10,12 134:5,8
51:12 110:11	start	17:14 84:22		141:14 142:13
speciality	19:14 58:25 78:14		suggest 132:12 136:9	surely
47:15	80:15 135:9	stopping 85:19	suicide	128:15
specially	started	street	70:2 73:3	
121:8,14	16:8 146:4	2:10 3:17	suite	suspect 99:2
specialty	starting	strictly	3:18	
6:25	17:11 89:7 90:25	33:3 49:5	summarize	suspects 47:2
specific	starts	structural	87:18	syllabus
8:7,18,21 47:18	114:22	76:21 77:9,15	summarized	8:24
50:2 57:1 64:25	state	90:11	88:16	system
65:17,17,18,18	20:16 27:8,25	structurally	summarizing	8:17 11:17,21
82:15 84:1 106:7	28:2,7,16,17	77:7,17 109:24	79:22	12:15 22:15 25:3
125:9 130:24	44:12 48:19,21	114:14		39:13,16 40:16
131:1 144:12,23	59:25 60:13 64:21	structure	32:2 38:12 112:20	44:5 56:24 58:22
specifically	65:7,8,12 66:15	27:14 31:10 41:6	superior	58:25 59:7,21
8:12 13:7 63:10	66:15 74:15 75:15	63:21 64:10 73:17	43:14	60:18 64:13,15,23
74:8 75:23 85:4	75:21 83:6 84:11	77:12 78:2 96:2	supernutshell	74:6,7,14,16
134:13 144:25	85:11 89:13 114:4	100:22 102:9,10	11:6	75:14 83:22 84:12
specified	116:5 120:16	103:2 129:11	supervises	85:12,16,22 86:18
47:15,16	137:7	145:1	100:6	87:19 88:8,13,20
specify	stated	students	supervising	100:19 103:24
50:18	45:13 116:21	72:2,8	101:4	114:9 127:22,25
speculation	125:2	studied	supervision	128:25 132:13
26:2 31:21 55:1	statement	5:21 15:9 119:14	14:24 100:1,6	systems
56:2 66:23 105:17	19:2,6,6,8,9 79:8	study	suppose	73:17 88:13
115:8 129:7 131:9	80:4 93:20 109:5	45:17 99:4 112:8	60:11 78:14,17	
132:2 133:4	statements	studying	85:10 114:2	T
136:13	70:6 75:12 92:24	5:14,24 17:21	supreme	take
spirit	states	subheading	56:10,14,19 82:9	29:19 34:6,13
38:16	1:1 43:17,20,22	79:12	119:10 120:21,23	35:25 36:3,11
	I	I	I	I

				Page 2.
20 14 20 7 40 1	4.11.	140.0	45 10 20 04 22	0 10 0 15 10 14
38:14 39:7 42:1	telling	148:8	45:18,20 94:23	8:18 9:15 12:14
47:20 49:17 57:3	107:25	thesis	96:13,19	118:5 122:1
97:3 114:24 124:6	temporary	14:22 15:21 16:22	thought	topics
124:12 134:18	21:3,24 22:1	thing	11:7 13:4 25:25	9:14,15,21 12:14
140:2 146:19	111:19	6:14 10:19 17:4	28:10 104:3	torture
taken	ten	37:9 82:15 97:7	thousands	11:2 12:18 42:24
2:7 49:18 73:22	59:17	120:17 145:8,10	52:7,8 54:8	42:25 46:21 57:6
108:21 124:9	tenure	145:11	101:12	57:11 146:12
146:20 148:4	77:10	things	threat	touches
149:5	term	9:20 13:16 23:16	49:10 129:17	12:14
takes	22:1 31:11 46:20	38:18 88:15 90:19		traffic
73:25	51:12 84:24	97:3 113:11,20	threaten	82:4
talk	terms	119:7 121:11	83:6	trainee
41:24	66:9	134:18	threats	6:9
talked	territorial	think	69:2 139:19	training
90:11,16 94:17	80:8,18 86:3,15	7:11 8:18,20,24	140:14	5:21,22,25 6:23
119:13 133:24	86:16 91:13	9:13,24 11:23	three	7:3,4 96:6 108:12
talking	135:19	12:5,19,20,21,23	5:14 8:9,9,9,10,23	transcribed
35:22 65:19 68:1	territories	15:18,24 17:18	60:16 95:17 97:3	149:7
82:15 86:15 87:5	62:11 80:7 81:6	18:22 21:9,25	116:25	transcript
87:6 101:11	100:19	22:7 23:19 25:1	time	16:6,10,12 149:5
124:12 131:2	territory	25:14 27:12 28:10	8:9 15:13 16:1,16	149:7
134:12	23:11 28:3,9	28:10 31:2,2,4	16:19,23 21:2,4,8	transcription
talks	76:15 80:5,16	33:4,6,19 34:3	31:9 42:2 49:6,6	148:8
32:6	88:21 91:25 92:4	35:4 36:13,19,25	53:2,2 67:10	transcripts
targeted	99:18 136:18	37:17 38:4,11,15	80:15 93:4,15	16:4
9:18 68:9 69:16	138:6,7	39:3 40:15,16	104:13 115:9	transferred
targeting	terror	43:25 45:20 46:13	119:8 124:4 125:6	128:12 135:21
69:12,17	69:4	46:25 49:6,12	127:4,15 128:25	136:18,20 137:4
task	terrorism	51:23 52:3 53:10	131:17 144:4,13	137:12
44:19	105:22 129:17	54:15 59:24 61:20	times	transit
taught	130:16 137:2	65:17 68:8,11,13	48:12 61:10,14	21:3 111:19
11:15 56:9	139:9	77:1 82:17 84:16	62:7,8	translation
teach	terrorists	90:7 91:19,21	tipoff	63:16
7:24 8:1,11	82:6,7 114:10	93:22 98:25 99:24		transperfect
teaching	test	100:7,16 103:21	title	149:3
8:6 11:16	36:7	104:16,21 105:7	9:6,13	treat
technical	testify	106:21 111:3	today	122:1
93:3,14	146:6	116:1,4 117:2	5:8 19:7,10 20:6	treaties
tel	testimony	120:14 122:14	30:18 63:14 85:8	42:8 43:7
3:8,20 5:21 6:1,4	148:4 149:4,8	124:6 125:11	114:7 115:4,7,15	treatment
6:8 8:6,15,16 9:7	text	126:11,14 127:5	119:6 126:5	95:24 96:11
9:9 11:15 87:15	112:6,7 133:11	128:19 129:6	toilet	146:11
87:23 88:5,6	thank	132:3,15,18,18,21	73:19 124:5	treaty
tell	5:8,16 13:4,4 39:9	132:21 133:1	told	40:21 42:11,13
19:14 51:21 52:15	39:14 42:3 63:25	136:14 142:12,19	24:20 106:5	48:20 50:5,21,22
121:1 129:11	79:7 117:13	thinking	top	51:1 116:19
143:22 144:25	141:10 146:23,24	47:23,25 72:15	61:20 125:25	trial
145:2	thereof	third	topic	16:4 53:8,18
			-	
1				

				Page 22
	l		l	
104:22,23,25	85:25 86:20 87:19	103:2,4	victims	124:14
105:3,13 108:18	87:22 88:12 110:6	united	118:7	war
108:21 109:10	110:7,9,9,9	1:1 74:24 75:7	view	10:5 11:10 44:21
114:11,13 116:10	114:25 116:25	118:15 119:10,17	45:12 73:12 76:22	45:7 46:18,19
116:16 119:25	144:14	122:23 123:1,9	77:4 78:6,21,23	66:18,18 69:8,18
123:5 126:24	type	126:18,19	78:24 81:2 97:9	69:22 71:13
143:1 144:24	67:5	units	97:16 99:19	114:22 123:9
146:2	U	103:3	113:14 115:5	125:22
trials		unity	views	wars
22:17 106:7	uhhuh	102:9	91:23	66:9
111:20 115:20	7:23	universities	violate	washington
145:6	uk	7:25	74:20 76:11 78:23	3:19
tribunal	31:19 32:7 37:13	university	78:24	watch
103:14 123:5	37:13 74:15	5:11,15,22 7:24	violated	71:19,22 72:1
126:25	un	8:7,16 11:16	121:15,17	73:2,8,11
tried	10:25 11:1 116:20	14:23 17:16	violating	way
18:1 80:5 81:4,15	116:20 118:2,4,17	unrelated	87:1	14:4 15:10 28:22
92:2,8 110:1	118:25	93:3,15	violation	30:21 32:6 41:25
111:9 121:7 122:3	unacceptable	use	64:5 76:4,24 77:2	45:2 56:10 77:5
123:12	81:1	25:25 27:1 51:11	79:3,5 141:16,17	77:10 106:22
true	underlining	uses	violence	115:6 118:24
41:20 44:18 113:6		132:11 133:13	69:3 73:13 92:1	122:1 141:16
148:7 149:8	understand	usual	virtually	145:11 149:13
trumps	17:13 21:18 24:10	47:2	44:13	ways
47:18	27:4,24 28:11,19	usually	virtue	56:24 110:9
trust	29:7 30:23 53:5	47:1 53:19 58:4	42:9 99:10	wearing
66:7 75:13	55:17 66:21 82:24	62:14	vs	27:13
try	89:11 91:21 92:6	usuals	1:8	weeks
17:13 22:11 24:13	95:11,17 98:21	47:3		12:17
25:8 27:10 64:5	109:21 110:17,19		W	weill
72:25 82:2,3,4	110:20,23,24	V	wait	1:18 2:2 4:2,8,10
84:4 90:9 111:8	111:4,13,17	vague	57:17	5:2,6 14:9,10 30:6
121:20	understanding	20:21 74:2	want	32:14 89:9,9
trying	31:17 112:13	variety	32:19 39:15,19	146:21,23 148:3
49:9 70:7 92:17	understood	79:19	41:24 45:18 47:4	148:14 149:4
122:2	51:4 87:23 131:7	various	49:21 50:23 53:7	150:2,24
turkey	131:14 136:10	133:25	66:6 68:15 73:16	weills
116:25 117:9	undue	vary	77:11 79:8 81:7	101:17
turn	144:2 146:2	27:19	82:12 83:1 84:1	welcome
32:18 124:22	unequal	verbatim	88:7 89:6 92:25	64:1
126:24 127:7	82:16,16 95:24	149:8	93:18 94:13,18	wellregarded
135:17	unfortunately	verdicts	96:2 97:3 98:23	56:1
twisting	25:4	108:7	101:14 104:7	went
81:14	unified	verify	109:5 114:8,10,10	8:8 15:15 124:12
two	86:4,18	75:16	114:12 121:1	126:10,18
8:21,25 12:17	uniform	version	130:22 134:18	west
16:13 36:9 53:23	44:13 91:25	14:22	135:6 141:11	17:6 22:4 25:3,7
64:14 80:22,24,24	126:21	versus	wanted	25:10 27:23 30:17
80:25 84:12,12,21	unit	22:1 117:9	5:9 67:13 98:11	39:21 40:5 59:6
00.20 02,12,21				1 10.0 00.0
	I		I	I

62:5,19 64:3	109:8 111:2 112:6	15:15,17 16:2	112:12,12,15,21	1
70:15,24 82:21	written	17:1,3,7,8,17	116:2,14 117:16	1
83:5 85:16,22	21:25 37:14 49:9	18:13 19:12,19,22	117:22,22 118:1,1	3:8,9 4:8 14:9,13
86:3,18 88:9	72:2,8 116:24	19:24 21:19 22:6	118:17 119:4,12	16:20 65:25 67:17
113:17 128:25	136:15	22:10 24:1,9,25	119:14,14,18,19	67:18 68:19 88:12
weve	wrong	25:20,23 26:4,7	120:7,16,19 121:6	
89:20 92:22	70:19 81:21 117:1	26:25 27:3,12	121:18,22 122:7,7	95:14,20 101:14
124:15 147:1	wrote	28:19 29:5,23	122:11,19,21	120:10 137:24
whatsoever	22:21 79:12,17	31:13,16 32:5,12	123:6,8,8,10,14	138:8,10,11,12,13
71:9 142:14	101:6 109:15,15	33:8,12 34:4,15	123:16,21,22,23	138:13,15,17,18
wish	101.0 107.13,13	34:17,24 35:1,2,4	123:16,21,22,23	139:17
59:11	X	35:4,4,4,6,8,8,10	124:6 126:9,16,20	10 10 20 22 10
withdraw	xii	35:12,24 36:2,2,4	126:22 127:3,9,11	19:18,20 32:18
85:16	139:14	36:4,5,12,15,23	127:24 128:21	49:19
witness	xiii	36:25 37:17,18,18	127:24 128:21 129:4,25 130:18	100224690
20:23 44:22 90:13	138:22 139:3,5,5	37:22 38:5,5,23	130:19 132:3,9,10	3:7
94:4 130:8 145:19		40:2,7 41:4,9,10	133:9 134:2,6,10	10764
146:24 149:4	Y	, , ,	135.9 134.2,0,10	1:25
wonderful	yalowitz	41:11,11,14,14,18	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	11
	3:3,10 4:3 5:4,5	41:21,21,23,23	136:21,23 137:12 137:18 138:5,18	73:21,23 109:5,8
74:13,15	12:25 13:4,10	42:3,7,21 43:8,9	,	114:17
wondering	14:8,14 20:19	43:11,15,24 44:3	139:11,13,16	1113
40:3	21:22 24:11 26:5	44:5,10,10 45:1,3	140:17 141:25	3:8
word	32:1,14,17 38:9	45:3,24 46:21	144:8	12
10:11 28:6 37:22	49:17,20 55:4	47:1,3,24 48:5,23	year	1:20 2:4 5:3
38:7,14 44:7	56:5 63:24 67:1	49:15 50:8 51:2,7	5:17,22 6:23 89:7	63:18 114:17
50:21 51:15 82:24	69:25 70:13 73:24	51:9,9,9,12,16	114:25 123:6	117:25 124:8
110:20 127:16	74:4 75:13,19	52:1,15 53:24	years	124
wording	76:2 90:4 92:15	54:9,20 55:6,11	5:14 7:17 8:9,10	4:12
49:7,11,12 99:3	94:12 101:16,18	55:23 56:21 57:2	8:23,25 21:11	13
130:4	105:20 106:1,8,13	57:4,7,9,13,21	80:11 81:10,20	79:9 84:3 90:25
words	106:16 107:17	58:19 59:3,12	84:24 91:11	134
34:6 36:3,9 98:19	108:5,10,16,25	60:15 62:2 65:1	101:10 102:15	4:13,14
132:11 133:13	113:3 115:2 124:6	65:19,19,24 66:5	111:22 114:25	1399
work	124:11 125:10	67:9,16 68:24	115:12	3:9
6:8,12,22 7:2	124.11 123.10	72:10,14 73:18	yesh	14
13:15 15:7 72:9		75:4,6,10,11 76:9	31:5	4:8,10 66:13
87:16 108:24	131:12,22,25 132:4 133:7,23	78:16 83:2,2 85:6	yesterday	73:21 79:13,20
worked	132:4 133:7,23	88:4,4,4,4,6 89:4	127:14	150
73:15	141:24 145:23	89:13,18,18 91:20	york	52:1
working		93:9,11,21 95:10	1:2 3:7	16
6:19,24 7:15 64:8	146:15,17,19,22	95:21 96:2,12,21		96:19 98:1,3,6,6,7
101:10	146:25 147:3	96:23 97:2 98:10	Z	139:5
world	yeah	98:14,17 99:8,20	zones	160
112:17	5:12,19 6:7,7,18	100:20 101:20	86:20	51:25
worth	7:9,20,22,25 8:22	102:24 104:8	<u> </u>	17
104:22 134:6	8:25 9:1,8,21,24	105:25 106:5,18	0	95:7 96:14,19
wow	9:25,25 10:4,17	108:15 109:7,15	000	98:1,3 117:11,12
98:5	10:20 12:3,8,10	110:16,21 111:12	51:25 52:1	134:22,23 135:1
write	12:12,22,22,24	111:14 112:10,10	04cv397	135:14 140:21
	13:3,19 14:6,7		1:9	155.11110.21
L	. '		•	•

				Page 24
18	2011	27.9 12	47	
		37:8,12		9
68:12 135:4,5,11	12:12 84:8	32	23:5	9
1940s	2013	4:11 37:19,21	4b	1:20 2:4 5:3 95:6
122:17	1:19 2:3 5:1	38:6,11,19,20	135:24	101:21,23
1942	63:18 148:5,19	32a	5	900
123:7,9	149:5,19	38:22,24	$\frac{3}{5}$	3:18
1949	2026265800	33	_	90s
21:2	3:20	37:19,21 38:6,11	4:3,13 124:19	43:2 51:23 52:1
1958	2026265801	38:19	134:14,15,16	99
37:16	3:21	34	50	54:2 57:7,8,9
1967	21	39:5,8	52:7	9th
17:22 18:4,12	25:16 27:11 28:21	35	551	12:17
20:9 51:20 54:1	29:6 89:19,20,21	49:19 112:5	4:13	
1977	105:15,21 106:9	36	58	
65:25 67:6	107:11,14,18	4:13,14 98:5,8,15	37:15	
1995	108:7,11,17	98:16 112:7	6	
40:3 128:22	142:15,24,25	36d	$\frac{0}{6}$	
1999	143:5,11,18 144:1	100:10	=	
89:7	144:10,21 146:2,6	37	4:14 39:21,24	
	146:10	147:1	134:14,15,16	
2	212	38	634	
2	3:8,9	147:6	4:14	
4:9 14:10,13	22	398	64	
79:12 82:15 83:13	1:19 2:3 5:1	18:18	19:3 20:1,8,24	
84:2 88:13 90:24	148:5 149:5,19	399	23:19,23 24:4,14	
90:25,25 91:1,1,1	24	3:6	24:19 99:10	
94:25 95:1,14,15	32:20,22 73:23		655	
95:22,23 138:2,22	25	4	3:17	
139:5 147:6	2:10 33:1,1,10,13	4	66	
2000	33:17 34:3,6	4:12 47:25 48:6	23:19 37:17,18	
5:18	37:16	124:10,15 128:19	39:17 63:3 80:4	
200055701	26	128:20 129:14	92:19 94:20 97:9	
3:19	34:11	134:15,22 135:17	97:16,18 98:21,23	
2001	27	135:17 137:13,17	98:24 110:4,25	
117:12	34:22 35:3	137:21 140:12	114:16,18	
2003	28	147:3,4	67	
58:14 61:12	35:7,9 124:18	400	16:8 17:11 52:1	
2004	29	117:11	63:17 80:11	
76:14 102:10,12	35:11,13 36:1,18	42	102:15	
102:15,18 103:1		123:8	6th	
103:11,22 104:11	3	43	13:13	
106:3	3	24:2 33:8 34:17		
2005	4:11 32:14,16	35:19 36:17	7	
103:3	121:17 135:10,12	44	715	
2006	147:1	101:10	3:8,9	
57:7 68:9	30	45	75	
2007	36:21 37:1 52:22	21:11 81:10,20	120:12	
14:19 20:5 51:23	144:15	84:24 111:22	0	
87:7 117:11	31	115:12 124:8	8	
J 11/111	- -	110.12 12 1.0		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>